

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3032. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3033. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Lawrence County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3034. Also, petition of the Mahoning Valley Garden Club of Lawrence County, Pa., opposing the destruction of Cook's Forest, Clarion County, Pa.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3035. Also, petition of the Lawrence County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, urging the immediate suspension of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and others, and the liquidation of their assets as fast as economically possible, thus saving millions of dollars to our hard-pressed United States Treasury as well as releasing thousands of employees for more important war work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3036. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Automotive Machinists, No. 1305, at San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3037. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of Ida L. Dye, of Findlay, Ohio, and the signatures of 65 of my constituents of Hancock County, Ohio, urging passage of the late Senator Sheppard's bill, S. 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and so give the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917, viz, legal protection from the traffic in all alcoholic beverages and from commercialized prostitution in camp areas which threaten the health, morale, and efficiency of our defenders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3038. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Emmet H. Bozel, of Washington, D. C., and Leavenworth, Kans., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In joy and in sorrow, in victory or defeat, in all times and occasions, be Thou our confidence and strength as we pray, our Father, in the name of our Master. As Thou art one with all sufferers, the perplexed, and all in need, help us, O Lord, to walk in Thy ways. Waken in our breasts the unutterable silences and may we follow the Good Shepherd into the green pastures of love and by the streams of blessed quietness.

Enable us to meet every demand with a just purpose and with a simple directness, pledging ourselves, in all fidelity, to serve courageously and even to endure every challenge involved in our high calling. O Thou, who dost set keepers to guard the city of the soul, give Thine angels charge over our sons of freedom on other soils and their sleepless mothers.

Grant that the whispers of the divine voice may make the chambers of affection so holy that all gloom shall be softened and great peace attained under the tutelage of our Saviour. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 5, 1942:

H. R. 69. An act to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 483. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1162. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman;

H. R. 1595. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 1757. An act for the relief of James D. G. Alexander;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Dorothy Silva;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 3488. An act to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-a-Chucky Dam site;

H. R. 4347. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-day Adventists;

H. R. 4476. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the de-

velopment of a proper entrance road to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4733. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5287. An act relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.;

H. R. 5438. An act for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5636. An act to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Wade;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5778. An act for the relief of Luther Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6625. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910;

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 7008. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000 in excess of existing authority;

H. R. 7097. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849);

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund;

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

On June 6, 1942:

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; and

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7036. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7041. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Civil Service Commission.
4. Interstate Commerce Commission.
5. Railroad Retirement Board.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LESSEES

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6071, to grant a preference right to certain oil

and gas lessees, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. ROBINSON of Utah, WHITE, and ENGBRIGHT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by Commissioner John C. Page before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the Congress Hotel, Chicago, on May 30, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the joint committee in the hearing on the Columbia River power bill, H. R. 6889, this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by a former Member of this House, William S. Bennet, of New York, president of the Empire State Society, Sons of the American Revolution. His article is on Flag Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech of the president general of the American Irish Historical Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

INDIANA LEADS IN OVERSUBSCRIPTION OF MAY WAR BONDS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, if members of the Hoosier delegation are strutting a bit today, or if our chests are somewhat expanded, there is a very good reason for it. For the announcement has just been made that Indiana led all other States of the Union in War Bond sales for May, oversubscribing its quota by 15 percent.

The following news story, which I believe should be printed in the RECORD in

capital letters, is a source of pride to all Hoosiers and a challenge to the patriotism and generosity of all other Americans:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of Saturday, June 6, 1942]

INDIANA LEADS IN OVERSUBSCRIPTION OF MAY WAR BONDS

INDIANAPOLIS, June 6.—Indiana led all other States in the Nation's May War Bond sales by exceeding its quota 15 percent, Wray E. Fleming, State administrator of the war saving staff, announced today.

With the highest percentage of oversubscription, the State marked up a sales total of \$14,252,399.26. One of the 116 reporting units still must be added to this total. The May quota for the State was \$12,894,300.

The State's quota for June has been set at \$14,876,200, almost \$2,000,000 higher than that for May, Fleming said.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article on the Alaskan Highway by Richard Neuberger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement I made before the House Committee on the Civil Service, and also a letter and a telegram from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I made with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] last night, in opposition to the repeal of the poll tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, at the observance of the one hundred and thirty-fourth birthday of Jefferson Davis, I delivered an address in the rotunda of the Capitol. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein that address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial relating to the fact that four sons of President Roosevelt are on the fighting front.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of June 5, written by William Philip Simms. It is entitled "Finland's Status."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 29, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35, 38, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, and 123, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "§534.422: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"National defense activities: For expenses necessary for the planning activities of the National Resources Planning Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; traveling expenses; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the Act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; purchase of office equipment and supplies without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the amount involved in any case does not exceed \$50, and not to exceed \$50,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to said section 3709; or classification laws, \$200,000, of which not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available for printing and binding.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,394,632"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$119,738,628"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and in line 3 of the restored matter strike out "\$270,535" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$854,998"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted insert the following: "": *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$90,000 of the sum herein authorized shall be expended in the District of Columbia for purposes of the Public Relations and Education Division"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following "\$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted insert the following: "Provided further, That except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1461-1468)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,311,292"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out amended to read as follows: "and not to exceed \$500 for periodicals and newspapers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$135,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "law books, books of reference, and not to exceed \$100 for periodicals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,068,677"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,504,192"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "for traveling expenses not to exceed \$16,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "purchase as provided by section 6 of the Act approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law Numbered 527)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Where appropriations in this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted by the appropriations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. Where appropriations in this Act are expendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the amount of \$50, but this limitation shall not apply to the Office of Government Reports and the Selective Service System: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of

the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are herein provided."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 18, 24, 30, 32, 34, 113, 114, and 115.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
GERALD P. NYE,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 6430, making appropriations for the executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate providing for the salary of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at the rate of \$12,000 per annum.

Amendments Nos. 2, 3, and 4, relating to the National Resources Planning Board: Appropriates \$534,422 for salaries and expenses of the Board, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate and \$668,845, as proposed by the House, and includes the language of the Senate restricting the functions of the Board to work authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board. Funds for national defense activities, proposed by the House, and eliminated by the Senate, are restored to provide \$200,000 for this purpose, including not to exceed \$50,000 for temporary employment without regard to certain laws; and \$20,000 for printing and binding.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6, relating to the Office of Government Reports: Appropriates \$1,075,000 for salaries and expenses, and \$18,730 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,475,000 and \$25,000, respectively, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Corrects a total.

Amendments Nos. 10, 12, 14, 15, and 16, relating to the Civil Service Commission: Limits the amounts which may be expended for travel from the regular appropriation for salaries and expenses to \$130,356, and from national defense funds to \$412,020, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$5,500,000 for salaries and expenses under the regular salary appropriation, instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$5,861,527, as proposed by the House; provides \$7,446,128 for salaries and expenses, national defense, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,491,908, as proposed by the House; and corrects the total of funds appropriated to the Civil Service Commission.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25, relating to the Federal Communications Commission: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel from regular salaries and expense funds to \$52,110, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$2,000,000

for regular salaries and expenses, of which \$1,218,260 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,300,000, of which \$1,401,500 may be expended in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House; limits the amount which may be expended for travel from the appropriation for salaries and expenses, national defense, to \$112,140, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$2,655,159 for salaries and expenses, national defense, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,667,619, as proposed by the House; and corrects the total of funds appropriated to the Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 26, 27, and 28, relating to administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, Federal Loan Agency: Provides \$241,575, for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$250,000, as proposed by the House; eliminates funds for the purchase of newspapers and attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate; and provides \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House, for temporary employment without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Amendment No. 29, relating to the Electric Home and Farm Authority: Provides \$200,000 for salaries and administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31, relating to the Export-Import Bank of Washington: Restores the paragraph proposed to be eliminated by the Senate and amends the amount made available for administrative expenses so as to provide \$200,000 for such purpose, instead of \$270,535, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33, relating to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Appropriates \$1,375,000 for administrative expenses, instead of \$1,500,938, as proposed by the House, and \$1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 35, 36, and 37, relating to the Federal Housing Administration: Provides \$14,621,499 for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,041,343, as proposed by the House, limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to \$854,998, instead of \$806,837, as proposed by the Senate; restores the language of the House limiting the amount which may be expended for public relations and education division work in the District of Columbia, amended to provide that not exceeding \$90,000 shall be expended for such purpose; strikes out the proposal of the Senate prohibiting the use of any funds in the District of Columbia for public relations and education work; and eliminates the provision of the House making \$50,000 available for tests by the Bureau of Standards in connection with the development of suitable materials for low cost housing.

Amendment No. 38, relating to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Provides \$400,000 for administrative expenses of this agency, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$450,443, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 39, 40, and 41, relating to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: Provides \$13,500,000 for administrative expenses, instead of \$15,153,712, as proposed by the House, and \$12,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to \$600,000, instead of \$580,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the House making \$50,000 available for tests by the Bureau of Standards in connection with the development of materials for low cost housing, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House setting forth the statute

under which the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, etc., eliminating the proposal of the Senate with reference thereto; and strikes out the proposal of the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for the maintenance of regional offices.

Amendments Nos. 42, 43, and 44, relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Provides \$10,311,292 for administrative expenses, instead of \$10,335,292, as proposed by the House, and \$10,310,792, as proposed by the Senate; limits the amount which may be expended for travel expense to \$207,000, as proposed by the Senate; and restores the language of the House with reference to the purchase of periodicals and newspapers, limiting the amount available for that purpose to \$500.

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49, relating to the Federal Power Commission: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses from regular appropriations to \$166,500, provides \$2,000,000, for salaries and expenses of which \$1,000,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of \$2,303,125, and \$1,217,500, respectively, as proposed by the House; and corrects two totals; all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 50, 51, and 52, relating to the Federal Trade Commission: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expense to \$124,380, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,252,224, as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, 55 and 56, relating to general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Administration: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to \$135,000, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the authorization for the use of funds for attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$1,100,000 for this activity, of which not to exceed \$600,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of \$1,226,540 and \$707,090, respectively, as proposed by the House, and \$1,000,000 and \$500,000, respectively, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57, relating to salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia and adjacent area: Appropriates \$19,656,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$17,656,500, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 60, relating to the Public Roads Administration: Appropriates \$16,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$22,000,000, as proposed by the House, for elimination of grade crossings, strikes out the paragraph in the House bill providing \$500,000 for public lands highways, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 and 68, relating to the United States Housing Authority: Provides \$4,277,132 for salaries and expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,526,930, as proposed by the House; limits the amount available for traveling expenses to \$243,993; strikes out provisions in the House bill for the purchase of automobiles, the purchase of books, etc., attendance at meetings, the preparation and transportation of exhibits, the employment of persons or organizations without regard to Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the use of funds for informational and educational purposes, and for tests in connection with the development of materials for use in low cost housing, and prohibits the use of funds for informational service functions, all as proposed by the Senate. The sum of \$13,000,000 is provided for annual contributions, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 69, 70, 71, 72 and 73, relating to the General Accounting Office: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to \$145,845, as proposed by the Senate; restores the language of the House with reference to the purchase of law-books, books of reference, and periodicals, amended to provide that not to exceed \$100 may be expended for periodicals; makes \$100,000 of the appropriation for contingent expenses and \$12,000 for printing and binding immediately available as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91, relating to the Interstate Commerce Commission: These amendments place specific restrictions on the amounts which may be expended for travel expenses. The House conferees have agreed to such limitations with the exception of amendments 78 to 83, inclusive, with reference to safety of employees, signal safety systems, and locomotive inspection and the restrictions are eliminated in connection with these items.

Amendments Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95 and 96, relating to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to \$59,328, and adjusts the total amount available for salaries and expenses due to such limitation, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$7,071,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000,000, as proposed by the House for an aircraft engine research laboratory; strikes out the provision in the House bill increasing the limit of cost of such laboratory; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 97, 98, 99 and 100, relating to the National Archives: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to \$4,400, and strikes out the authorization of funds for expenses of attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$1,032,725, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,134,325, as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 101, 102, and 103, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission: Appropriates \$200,000 for this activity, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$900,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 104, 105, and 106, relating to the Securities and Exchange Commission: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to \$270,000, as proposed by the Senate, appropriates \$4,850,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,380,000, as proposed by the House, and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 107, 108, and 109, relating to the Tariff Commission: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to \$16,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$853,200, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$810,000, as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses, and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 110, 111, 112, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority: Provides for the construction of terminals on the Tennessee River, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House permitting the purchase of automobiles amended to require compliance with section 6 of the act of April 28, 1942; and limits the amount expendable for travel to \$615,236, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 116, 117, 118, and 119: Provides that the construction fund of the United States Maritime Commission shall be available for loans to contractors and subcontractors in accordance with and to carry out Executive Order 9112; provides funds for the support of a marine school in Maine; and corrects a total; all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120: Excepts citizens of the Philippines from the requirements of section 3 of the bill relating to citizenship.

Amendment No. 121: Inserts the provision of the Senate limiting expenditures for travel to the Budget estimates submitted therefor.

Amendment No. 122: Inserts the provision of the Senate limiting expenditures for newspapers and periodicals, amended so as to permit the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with performance of the authorized functions of the agencies involved.

Amendment No. 123: Corrects a section number.

Amendments reported in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement by the committee of conference:

Amendment No. 7, providing that appropriations in the bill for the Office of Government Reports shall not be supplemented from any other source by funds in excess of \$600,000.

Amendments Nos. 9, 11, and 13, relating to the Board of Legal Examiners, Civil Service Commission.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18, relating to the Alley Dwelling Authority.

Amendment No. 24, relating to payment of compensation to Goodwin Watson, an employee of the Federal Communications Commission.

Amendment No. 30, relating to the Electric Home and Farm Authority.

Amendment No. 32, relating to travel expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Amendment No. 34, relating to the laws under which expenditures of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall be administered.

Amendments Nos. 113 and 114, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Amendment No. 115, relating to the use of funds of the Maritime Commission for the construction of barges to be used in the transportation of oil, gasoline, and so forth.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy, so far as I know, about anything embodied in the conference report. It is a unanimous report. There are several amendments that will come up afterward about which there will probably be some discussion, but, so far as the conference report is concerned, I do not see why we should not dispense with the further reading of the statement, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 778)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5329, a bill "for the relief of J. J. McIntosh."

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of \$300 to J. J. McIntosh, of Bexley, Miss., in settlement of his claim against the United States on account of the damage to his automobile as a result of an accident which occurred on April 12, 1940, near Leakesville, Miss.

The claimant was appointed as a census enumerator in his locality in Mississippi on April 9, and on April 12 he received a request from his supervisor to report at Leakesville, some 12 miles distant from his home, for a conference. At the conclusion of the conference, while the claimant was en route to his home, his automobile was run into by a drunken driver, resulting in the complete demolition of the claimant's car, and resulting in a certain injury to the claimant. The claim was filed with the Employees' Compensation Commission for the personal injury sustained, as a result of which the claimant was paid an amount of \$144.44.

The contract of employment of the claimant did not require the use of his privately owned automobile. Since he could have employed other means of transportation, he was using his car on the night in question as a matter of personal convenience. Obviously, the Government is neither legally nor morally responsible as the insurer of the private property of an employee, especially when the property is used for the convenience of the employee.

I regret, therefore, that I do not feel that I would be justified in giving the bill my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message, together with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

COLUMBIA BOAT & BARGE SYSTEM, INC.
(H. DOC. NO. 779)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4999, a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc.

It appears to be claimed by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., that early in 1933 its representatives made inquiries of the United States district engineer at Portland, and of the Superintendent of Lighthouses, whether it was feasible for the company to engage in transportation by boat and barge to and from the upper Columbia River district. The claimant asserts that it received assurances in the affirmative, and that it proceeded to expend moneys in building up an organization for that purpose and to obtain contracts for the transportation of wheat.

It further appears from the War Department reports that on April 11, 1933, a break occurred in the Dalles-Celilo Canal, which empties into the Columbia River. Navigation was not restored in the canal until November 1934. It is asserted by the claimant that this circumstance prevented it from transport-

ing wheat by barge from the upper part of the State of Washington. The claimant seems to contend that there were negligence and undue delay on the part of the Government in repairing the break in the canal, and asserts a claim against the Government for moneys expended by it in preparing to operate, and for profits which it failed to make because of the closing of the canal.

The bill under consideration, unlike other private jurisdictional bills, would not merely waive the immunity of the United States to suit and afford a judicial remedy on the same basis as though the United States were a private individual or corporation but would go as far as establishing and assuming liability on the part of the Government and remitting the matter to the Court of Claims merely for the purpose of computing the amount due.

The alleged losses said to have been sustained by the claimant were similar to those that might have been suffered by any member of the public who had expected and planned to use the canal for the purposes of navigation and found it impossible to do so because of the closure of the canal resulting from a break. Even if it were the fact that the Government could have repaired the canal much sooner than it did, as is contended by the claimant, this fact is not sufficient to justify the payment of losses to a prospective user of the waterway. Were it to assume liability in this instance, the Government might be confronted with other similar claims on the part of other prospective users of the canal, and might also be presented with claims on the part of other individuals who claim to have suffered by reason of delay of governmental action. The situation presented in claims of this type is entirely different from that involved in claims for personal injuries of property damage caused by the negligence of a Government officer or employee under circumstances in which a private employer would be liable for the acts of his agents or employees.

In view of the foregoing circumstances, I am constrained to reach the conclusion that the Government should not assume the liability contemplated by this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message, together with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a telegram which I have today received from Walter L. Pierpont, president of the Association of Omaha Taxpayers, and the reply I have sent to the telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Senate adopted about 123 amendments to the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill. We have worked them over very carefully and have agreed on all but 13, which come back in disagreement and will be considered after we have disposed of the conference report.

The bill, as it passed the Senate, was \$16,150,459 above the Budget estimate. If the motions which the House conferees shall make with respect to the bill are adopted by the House and the bill enacted in that form, it will be \$19,002,303 below the Budget estimates. So far as I know there are no controversies embodied in the conference report itself. As I previously stated, there are several other matters in technical disagreement which we will take up after the conference report is disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will take just a minute for the purpose of emphasizing my satisfaction in the fact that this bill, as recommended by the conferees to the House, is some \$14,000,000 below the House figures and over \$19,000,000 below the Budget figures.

It seems to me this is about the first time in the memory of man that an important appropriation bill has come back to the House with substantial reductions below the House figures. It is not a long step, but, certainly, it is a step in the right direction. We may say it is at least a short step in the direction of the elimination of nonessential expenditures in order that every possible dollar may be available for our all-out war effort.

The following figures give the picture:

The bill, as passed by the House, was under Budget \$5,119,115.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, was under Budget \$19,964,653.

The bill, as recommended by the Conferees, is under Budget \$19,002,303.

The amount of Budget estimates, \$2,109,887,431.66.

Amount of bill, as recommended by Congress, \$2,090,885,128.66.

Bill is under Budget estimates by \$19,002,303.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 7: Page 7, line 10, insert "The appropriations herein made for the Office of Government Reports shall not be supplemented by funds from any source aggregating in excess of \$600,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the pending amendment deals with the Office of Government Reports. The House gave this agency \$1,475,000 for operating purposes, and \$25,000 for printing and binding. The Senate reduced it to \$1,075,000, or by \$400,000, and reduced the amount for printing and binding to \$18,730. The Senate also wrote into the bill a limitation to the effect that the Office of Government Reports appropriation shall not be supplemented from any other source by more than \$600,000. Obviously the Senate had the idea that the O. G. R. could obtain funds from the President's fund, if he were disposed to make allocations therefrom. I merely want to make the record clear, because it occurs to me that there are certain abuses in the matter of overdoing publicity in the way of movies, radio, and lecture material, and so forth. Recently I made a reexamination of the reports that came from the Budget Bureau to the Committee on Appropriations, dated June 25, 1941, a rather interesting document of 163 pages long, which deals with 153 agencies, which have 2,895 full-time and 31,618 part-time persons in its employ, at a cost of \$27,700,000, people engaged in press releases, publications, scripts, speeches, movies. The number of people so engaged is equivalent to 11 infantry regiments. It occurs to me that there is opportunity here for Congressional debate and investigation in respect to informational and publicity expenditure. Let me remark in passing that in 1941 there were 300,000,000 publications issued, 283,000,000 of which were not required by law. There were 12,000,000 copies of rulings, and 5,500,000 house organs, and a great deal of music can be had from 5,500,000 house organs, let me say. There were 4,000,000 manuals and handbooks, and 13,000,000 technical publications, 14,000,000 programs and study outlines, and 95,000,000 popular publications.

It occurs to me that sooner or later the Congress will have to come to grips with this matter and consolidate a great many of these agencies in the interest of more efficient, more economical, and more adequately supervised operations.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, amendments numbered 9, 11, and 13 relate to the Board of Legal Examiners. They are all involved in the same subject, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Line 16, page 11, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$7,500."

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 11, line 21, after the word "commission", insert "and including actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of sub-

sistence and other expenses of members of the Board of Legal Examiners serving as such while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States."

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 13, line 17, strike out the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Legal Examiners created in the Civil Service Commission by Executive Order No. 8743 of April 23, 1941."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to further insist upon the House disagreement to Senate amendments 9, 11, and 13, and state in that connection also that these three amendments inserted by the Senate have the effect of reinstating funds made available for the Board of Legal Examiners, which we have debated on the floor of the House many times, and in the committee. Neither the committee nor the House has ever seemed willing to embark on this unless some substantive legislation is passed on the subject.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which recalls to me an important matter which was brought to my attention. I believe there is a crying need in these trying times for the establishment of a bureau of propaganda analysis in order that we may counteract the propaganda that is coming to this country by way of Nazi propaganda agents and the Goebbels propaganda machine. A professor of Concordia College came to me a short while ago and discussed this very subject with me. He said that he was editing a very fine publication that was going into millions of homes, and could be of real help in our effort to fight this menace. What is happening? He said on one side of his desk every day pro-Nazi literature and pro-Nazi propaganda flowed in so that it stacked up 4 or 5 feet high, and that on the other side of his desk he received little or nothing from the Government here by way of facts or assistance to rebut that propaganda. He suggested a conference with the Director of the Bureau of Facts and Figures. I arranged that conference, and Mr. MacLeish agreed with him that it was absolutely necessary that we refute this Nazi propaganda, but informed him that he did not have the proper funds to operate with.

The appropriations limited him in funds so that he had only one stenographer and a mimeograph machine, with nobody to operate it.

I am firmly convinced, as I have stated many times, that what is needed most in our war program is a bureau of propaganda analysis. We are winning victories with our armed forces on land, on sea, and in the air, but losing ground on our home front because the Nazi propaganda artists are carrying on to such an extent that we, as a people, are being divided on issues vitally necessary to the winning of the war and the peace to follow.

Every time we try to appropriate money to combat this Nazi propaganda we are told that it will be used politically and some of you are misled.

It is not true that a bureau of propaganda analysis would be a political bureau. It would protect free speech but educate the people to recognize pure propaganda and not be misled by it. We must win this propaganda battle in order to win the war. Obstructionist groups will oppose a bureau of propaganda analysis because it will defeat their actions and bare the facts to the public. They cannot stand being brought out in the open. Wake up on this propaganda fight before it is too late.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to amendments 7, 9, 11, and 13, relating to the Board of Legal Examiners.

A motion has been made by the chairman of the House conferees to insist upon their opposition to the amendments, and that the conferees be instructed accordingly. My support of this particular amendment lies in the fact that from July 1, 1941, to May 1, 1942, the Government has engaged about 1,300 lawyers. Thirty-one percent of those attorneys have been engaged from the leading eastern law schools. Twelve percent have been engaged from the District of Columbia law schools. The big eastern colleges supplied 43 percent, or over 550, of these attorneys.

We have an excellent law school in Wisconsin, one of the foremost of the Nation. Minnesota and other Western States have good law schools. Our western lawyers are as good as those from the eastern cities. However, out of 1,300 new appointments, Wisconsin only received 28, or 2 percent of all the attorneys hired during that period.

It seems to me we ought to have some system whereby the lawyers in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and other distant States may have an opportunity to qualify and receive some of the appointments. That is the purpose of the amendments—to give the lawyers of all the States an equal opportunity to enter the Federal service.

I would say that this Board of Legal Examiners and the provisions made for it have been endorsed by resolution of the American Bar Association under date of March 3, 1942. I would also like to add that the June issue of the American Bar Association Journal has an editorial heartily favoring the idea of a Federal Board of Legal Examiners, and the development of a system which will permit the attorneys of all the States to be fairly treated in the matter of such appointments.

I have not the time to discuss the matter more fully, but it seems to me the House should concur in the Senate amendments and not reject them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the resolution and editorial to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY HOUSE OF DELEGATES, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MARCH 3, 1942

Resolved, That the association approves the principle of establishing a Federal Board of

Legal Examiners for the purpose of ascertaining by competitive and noncompetitive examinations the competence of persons to be engaged in the Federal legal service—for the establishment of a panel of persons eligible for appointment; further

Resolved, That the association believes that such procedure is in the public interest and represents an advance over the engagement of public legal services by methods having no uniform standard for ascertaining the competence, the extent of legal experience, and the repute of applicants for legal positions.

[From the American Bar Association Journal of June 1942]

THE FEDERAL BOARD OF LEGAL EXAMINERS

As the independent offices appropriation bill for 1943 passed the Senate on May 6, it carried authorization for the Federal Board of Legal Examiners to proceed with its work of developing a merit system for the selection of attorneys in the Federal service. The Senate followed the recommendation of its Appropriations Committee and removed from the bill a provision inserted by the House barring the use of funds for the Board after July 1, 1942. The bill is now in conference. It is hoped that the House conferees will acquiesce in the view that the Board should be permitted to develop the program which the President has committed to its charge.

The establishment of the Board by Executive order in April 1941 derives from the report of the distinguished Committee on Civil Service Improvement headed by Mr. Justice Reed. The primary functions of the Board are to hold competitive examinations for the establishment of registers of attorneys available for the Government service and, pending the establishment of registers, to pass noncompetitively on the qualifications of persons selected for appointment by the various departments and agencies. Only in the lower grades will written examinations be employed, and even there they will be designed to test capacity rather than memory. In all instances the examining process will lean heavily upon oral interviews before examining committees drawn from the profession itself. Most important of all, the examination and the interviews will be conducted throughout the country, with the result that recruitment for the Government legal service will proceed on a Nation-wide scale. This is a matter of considerable importance under ordinary circumstances. It is uniquely important at the present time when experienced lawyers everywhere are eager to serve the Government, if only for the duration of the war.

The Board of Legal Examiners has been at work for less than a year, but the record of the appropriation hearings leaves no doubt that it has made substantial progress. It has the confidence of the Attorney General and of the various Government counsel upon whose appointees it must pass. It has the support of the American Bar Association and the approval of the law schools. The Civil Service Commission, originally partial to a different program, has expressed complete satisfaction with the administration of the present plan. These are solid achievements which will be wasted unless the Senate's view prevails.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the chairman has moved to further insist. I do not believe that either the conferees or the House has taken an arbitrary attitude in this matter.

Back in 1938 the President issued an Executive order to cover in all attorneys

under civil service. That order was to be effective as of February 1, 1939. Meantime, they began to conduct an investigation and held hearings and studies on this whole problem regarding legal personnel. A committee was set up consisting of eight men, appointed by the President. When the committee finished its deliberations it filed a report in 1941. Oddly enough, that report showed considerable diversity of opinion. Four members of the President's committee favored plan A. Three members favored plan B, and one member favored plan C. It has been the opinion of the subcommittee that in view of this controversy the matter ought to be further studied and there should be substantive legislation on the subject.

That is the broad foundation upon which we stand in further insisting upon the position of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri to make a unanimous consent request.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider tomorrow under the general rules of the House, House Joint Resolution 324, the W. P. A. bill; that general debate be limited to 3 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, although I did not hear the gentleman's entire statement, I understand that it simply provides that this bill be given a privileged status and that it may be in order to call it up tomorrow, and fixing the time for debate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the general rules of the House.

Mr. TABER. Yes. While I am opposed to the bill, I can see no necessity of asking the gentleman from Missouri to go to the Rules Committee and ask for a rule. I think the limit of debate is sufficient to permit the discussion which I have found is demanded by the membership. I shall, as I have in the past, oppose the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill which the gentleman from Missouri is bringing in amounts to \$314,000,000, and \$7,405,000 for the set-up. Are you going to permit in that bill construction by the W. P. A. of more golf courses, more orchestras, and things of that kind that are unnecessary at this day when we are in war? If you are going to permit things of that kind, we ought not to permit you to even bring a bill of that kind on the floor without getting a rule. It seems to me the membership ought to be here tomorrow to nip this bill in the bud, and put it off the map like we did the C. C. C.

That is what the membership ought to do. The gentleman from Missouri ought not bring a bill of that kind in here.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say in response to the very pertinent inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that this bill decreases the amount from \$875,000,000 to \$280,000,000, a reduction of 68 percent, and that a large part of it will be spent for war projects.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman and I did not even know that the W. P. A. was permitting these things, or we would have tried to stop them. I know the gentleman would have, and I know I would have. The fact of the matter is you cannot control W. P. A. unless the Congress tells them to stop a thing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are assured there will be no ineffectual projects. On the contrary, the expenditures will contribute materially to the war program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 17 and 18 which relate to the same subject matter, the Alley Dwelling Authority, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 15, strike out all of lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and on page 16 strike out all of lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 16, line 6, insert the following:

"THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY"

"For the maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act, \$12,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources, after July 1, 1942, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, of the 'Conversion of inhabited alleys fund,' established pursuant to such act shall also be covered into the Treasury."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 17 and 18, and concur in the same; and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 18, line 22, strike out the proviso in lines 22 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further

insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24; and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 21, in line 9, after the word "elsewhere", insert "": *Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding \$150,000 in the aggregate (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That necessary expenses in collecting monthly installments on contracts and repossessing appliances in case of default, not to exceed \$2.50 per year per contract, shall not be considered as administrative expenses."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "": *Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding \$200,000 in the aggregate, including not exceeding a total equal to \$2.50 per year per contract (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia advise us what the object is of increasing the amount from \$150,000 to \$200,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the amount agreed upon after careful consideration by the conferees. It gives them an opportunity to handle contracts in liquidation.

Mr. RICH. Will the administration be more economical because of this larger fund?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The conferees thought that was a fair compromise of the situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might observe, if the gentleman would yield, that this amendment restores the amount to the figure allowed by the House.

Mr. RICH. But we are increasing it \$50,000 over the Senate amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; we are retaining the amount originally written into the bill by the House which we think is the proper amount under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 23 after the word "elsewhere", in line 7, insert "Not to exceed \$189,000 for."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement with the amendment of the Senate No. 32, and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 24, strike out all of lines 12 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That such sum shall be so apportioned and distributed by the Board over the fiscal year 1943, and shall be so administered during such fiscal year, as to (1) constitute the total amount that will be required for such expenses during such fiscal year and (2) prevent expenditures which will necessitate making additional sums available for such expenses during such year; and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the Board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665)."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its amendment of the Senate No. 34 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and add thereto the matter inserted by said amendment."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, amendments 113 and 114 relate to the same matter, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 113: Page 73, line 6, strike out "\$136,100,000" and insert "\$172,220,112."

Amendment No. 114: Page 73, strike out lines 7 to 16, inclusive, and to the word "that", inclusive, in line 17.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments, and I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me make a very brief but what I deem to be a rather pointed presentation of the issue raised between the Senate and the House in connection with T. V. A. The Tennessee Valley Authority, as you know, operates under the act of 1933, and the total capital expenditures for that function have now reached a total of about \$615,000,000. It exceeds the original estimate by about \$172,000,000.

The T. V. A. gets funds from three sources: First of all, from direct appropriations by Congress; secondly, from un-

expended balances that remain from one year to another; and third, from receipts of operations, such as the sale of fertilizer, the sale of power, the sale of miscellaneous services, and so forth.

There was written into the basic Tennessee Valley Act an amendment to the effect that they shall have full discretion in the expenditure of the money that they derive from the sale of power, and so forth. The Senate has contended all along that all of the money, whether receipts or not, ought to be covered into the Federal Treasury and that it ought to be reappropriated from one year to another, as provided by the Constitution relating to appropriations. That, as I see it, is about the only issue involved. It was the matter of the disposition of receipts. In the Grand Coulee Act, in the matter of Fort Peck and Bonneville, we make those agencies, which are proprietary institutions of government, cover their funds into the Treasury and secure a full appropriation from one year to another. So in this controversy that we have with the Senate, to which the Senate itself has devoted a considerable amount of time, was the question of the disposition of receipts, whether or not they should have discretionary power to allocate those receipts and cover the balance into the Treasury, or whether the entire amount should be subject to review and supervision by the Congress.

I had in mind proposing today a motion to concur with an amendment, but I shall not do so. In the first place, I am persuaded that an appropriation bill is not the place to do it and, secondly, if there is to be a better supervision by the Congress, if there is to be a closer supervision by the General Accounting Office, and if these funds are to be covered into the Treasury, the matter ought to be handled by the Congress through legislation rather than by a proviso in an appropriation bill. For this reason I do not propose today to disturb the House language, nor to register any opposition, but I do say that since 1933 the receipts of Tennessee Valley Authority have become very substantial. As late as 1939 the entire receipts amounted to only \$5,500,000, but they are up to \$36,000,000 at the present time, and the amount will grow as the years go by.

It is not only within the purview of the people's representatives, but I think it is their sworn duty to see that that money goes into the Treasury and is appropriated after full and fair justification. I shall forego any opposition today to the motion that has been proposed, the restoration of the House language, and I merely make emphatic to the House that this matter must have attention within the immediate future because all of the so-called power agencies generating, selling and transmitting power will increase in the size of their receipts, and that becomes a proper responsibility for the Congress.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What is the object of increasing this amount \$36,120,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If you are going to strike out the revolving fund, then obviously you have to give them the amount

of the receipts from sales and certain interdepartmental sales, plus certain miscellaneous revenues, which amounted to a little over \$36,000,000 and add that to their appropriation because it was so set up that they take into account the money derived from the sale of power. If you are going to strike that from the bill, you will have to supply an equivalent amount of money in their appropriation.

Mr. RICH. Are we going to have the Accounting Office look over their receipts and expenditures and audit them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are being audited by the General Accounting Office at the present time. Insofar as I know now their relationships are reasonably sweet.

Sometimes I have contended in the past—I am not so sure that I feel that way even now—that perhaps we ought to go a little further with this matter of accounting. However, it is provided for in the basic Tennessee Valley Authority Act and in the amendment that was added a year or two ago.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I take it the gentleman is in full sympathy with the objective the Senate has sought in proposing this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely so, but this is not the way to reach it. Moreover, you run into a real parliamentary difficulty, for it would be difficult to fashion language that would be germane and not subject to a point of order to accomplish the thing the Senate subcommittee had in mind.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I personally am in full accord with that point of view. I hope the subject can be worked out and that, as the gentleman suggested, it will accomplish a full accounting by the T. V. A. in accordance with the general practice of other agencies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to elaborate for just a moment on what the gentleman from Illinois has said about the importance of the Congress taking cognizance of the situation that is developing in these large business enterprises in which the country has become engaged. It seems to me that the Congress has the responsibility for examining the system of accounting, the handling of funds and their disbursement, of all the large governmental enterprises—the Panama Canal Zone, the Alaska Railroad, the Alaska Signal System, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and the T. V. A. Today, each has a law unto itself. We should formulate and adopt as a national policy a uniform method of handling these enterprises. That is the only way we are going to be able to discharge our responsibility and justify the appropriations and answer the questions that are going to be asked concerning the operation of the large business

enterprises which the Government has undertaken.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if this motion is carried, and the Senate concurs in it, that will mean the wiping out of the McKellar amendment to the T. V. A. Act.

As has been pointed out, this amendment, while it might not do what some of its proponents expect, it would seriously embarrass the Tennessee Valley Authority in carrying on its program, and, in my opinion, there would be no corresponding benefits to the Government to offset the injury the amendment would produce.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is doing a wonderful job. No agency of this Government is rendering a greater service during these perilous times than is the Tennessee Valley Authority. And I am unwilling to take any chances of injuring or handicapping or embarrassing the T. V. A. in any way by adopting an amendment which I regard as unnecessary, and probably injurious in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, I trust I may be pardoned for saying that I have a deep and abiding personal interest in the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority. As you all know, I was coauthor of the bill that created the T. V. A. in 1933. While the measure carried the number of the bill that came from the Military Affairs Committee of the House, the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted the bill introduced by Senator NORRIS in the Senate and by me in the House. It was enacted into law and is known as the T. V. A. Act.

Many of you remember the battle I went through here to secure the passage of that measure and the approval of the conference report which created the T. V. A. and started it on its course. I do not hesitate to say that the creation and development of the T. V. A. is the greatest accomplishment of this administration up to the present time. I will go further and say that it is the greatest development of its kind in history, and its benefits to the American people simply cannot be measured.

The T. V. A. and its yardstick rates are responsible for forcing reductions in electric light and power rates throughout the entire Nation. The savings to the American people in rates alone amount to more every year than the entire T. V. A. development has cost or will have cost when it is finished. Those reductions are largely traceable to the T. V. A., its yardstick rates, and the example it has given the Nation in rate reductions and in supplying electricity to the homes and business establishments in that area at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

I know what this means, because the district I represent touches the Tennessee River and extends southward for about 150 miles, and every person in that

district who uses electricity gets T. V. A. power at T. V. A. rates. It not only means a saving of something like \$2,000,000 a year in rates to the people in that one district, but it has increased the use of electricity manifold. It has also increased the use of those electrical appliances necessary to relieve the drudgery and increase the comforts and conveniences in the homes as well as in every business establishment throughout the territory.

I do not hesitate to say that nothing else that has ever been done for the people of that area compares with the benefits they are now receiving through the use of T. V. A. power.

In addition to that the T. V. A. is developing one of the great rivers of the Nation, making it navigable from its mouth to its source, and in that way transforming it into a great artery of transportation and commerce. It is helping to conserve the soil, and also to replenish it.

In other words, it is making the entire T. V. A. area a richer and a better place in which to live.

Out of this T. V. A. development grew our rural electrification program. I organized the first rural electrification cooperative associations in my own district, and through the assistance of the T. V. A. they were able to work out their program and to build the lines that gave us the first demonstration in real rural electrification, and set the example for the rest of the Nation.

I have told you many times of the experiment in Alcorn County, Miss., where the entire cooperative association for the county was paid out in 5 years, and where their rates have been reduced even below the T. V. A. yardstick rates. These rural power lines have now been spread all over that territory, until today the people who have electricity in their homes would not think of giving it up, and the ones who do not have it are appealing to us to help them get it. Of course the copper shortage at this time has slowed down the rural electrification program everywhere, but when that shortage is relieved it is my hope, and the hope of the gentlemen around me here who feel as I do on the power question, that the rural electrification program may be extended to reach every farm home in America.

We are in the beginning of an electric age. From this day forward our domestic, our commercial, and our industrial life will be geared to a power economy. The importance, the desirability, and the prosperity of every community, from the large metropolitan center to the country crossroads, will be measured by the availability of electric power and the rates the people have to pay for it.

Twenty years ago the American people used only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. When the T. V. A. program is finished it will produce about 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, or almost one-half as much as the entire Nation used 20 years ago.

Last year we used 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity in this country,

and this year it will probably run well above 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. I predict that long before the turn of the next century, probably within the next 25 years, the American people will be using a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

That will mean a great reformation in our way of living. Electricity will be used for all purposes. It will not only be used to light our halls and our homes, to run our industrial machinery, and for purposes of refrigeration, water pumping, washing machines, milking machines, hotbeds to sprout vegetables—it will not only be used for all these purposes, but the time is coming when every home and every business establishment will be heated with electricity, and when railroad trains and other transportation facilities will be electrically driven.

That will not mean throwing coal miners out of work, as some people would have you believe. Coal will be consumed at the mouth of the mine, and the electricity generated by it will be transmitted for hundreds of miles around. The gas that is now going to waste in our oil fields will be used to produce electric energy, as will much of the oil that is now going to waste.

There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production of undeveloped water power in this country that is now going to waste. There are other methods of generation that will be developed as time goes on, such as harnessing the tides of the ocean and utilizing the heat from the sun in arid areas, that will supply the world with all the electricity it can use not only now but for unnumbered centuries to come.

This electricity can be generated, transmitted, and distributed to every section of the Nation at the standard T. V. A. yardstick rates without financial loss to the Government or the agency that controls it, and those rates can be reduced as time goes on.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are in the beginning of the electric age and have spread out before us and our children the prospect of the most glorious period in all the economic history of mankind.

That program had its birth in the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which set the example and blazed the way for this onward march of modern progress. It has worked perfectly. To put it mildly, its success, its great accomplishments have been most gratifying to those of us who fought to create it and who have borne the battle for its protection and development throughout the years.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would be reluctant to accept any change that might in any way threaten to impede its progress or to handicap its development, or to embarrass its operations.

I therefore trust that the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] will be adopted and the McKellar amendment be removed from the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion

made by the chairman of the subcommittee to further disagree with the Senate amendments 113 and 114 and insist upon the House language. The House language is the same which has been used since the Congress began to make its first direct appropriation for the T. V. A. It is the language which was agreed upon after conferences which involved the President, the Director of the Budget, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Under this language the T. V. A. has carried on a wide and varied construction program in the operation of its power, flood control, fertilizer, and chemical programs and of the related activities of the Authority. The operations and the program of the T. V. A. have been carried out with dispatch, economy, and efficiency. A gigantic construction program in the Tennessee Valley area is being carried out ahead of schedule and under the original estimate of cost. This is a program of efficiency and economy never equaled by any governmental agency.

There has been no suggestion of fraud or waste in connection with the operations of the program. At all times the Authority has followed the mandate of the Congress with reference to its program. Under such circumstances it is strange to understand why anyone should seek to disturb the harmonious development and completion of the program. Especially is this true when we learn that practically all of the funds provided herein are directly related to the war effort. More than 65 percent, approximately 70 percent, of the power being developed by the T. V. A. is going directly into the war effort. This area is one of the greatest aluminum-producing areas of the Nation.

The House language provides for a single fund and a great degree of flexibility necessary in the operation and conduct of the affairs of the T. V. A. The effect of the House language is to make one fund for accounting and disbursing purposes of—

First, unexpended balances from previous fiscal years; second, the new appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year; and third, the receipts from all sources by the T. V. A. as the result of all of its operations. Without this language in the annual appropriation act the T. V. A. would be required to account from three appropriation accounts, as follows: First, from unexpended balances of the previous fiscal year for obligations incurred during that fiscal year; second, from the new appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year; and third, from the receipts of the T. V. A. which it is authorized to expend pursuant to section 26 of the T. V. A. Act, as amended, without annually appropriating them, for certain power and fertilizer operations.

The adoption of the Senate language would increase the amount of new money by \$36,120,112 over the amount of new money provided by the House bill, destroy the single fund and the reappropriation of unexpended balances, and complicate the accounting of funds. The Senate amendments would require that appropriated funds and revenue be kept in separate accounts with complete accounting systems for each fund, but

would not in any manner restrict the right of the Authority to use its revenues for the purposes set out in section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

Senate amendment No. 114 strikes from the House bill the language appearing in lines 7 to 17 on page 73. The omission of this language has but two effects: First, it eliminates the unexpended balance as previously explained, and, second, it abolishes the fund in the Treasury of the United States designated as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund." This fund is simply a convenient accounting device established in 1935 upon the recommendation of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget, and with the active support of the Appropriations Committee of the House. The language relating to this fund stricken by the Senate confers no power upon the T. V. A.—it was adopted originally solely because of the obvious convenience in having all of the funds available for expenditure by the T. V. A. in any given fiscal year placed in a single fund in the Treasury. Under this system all funds appropriated and all receipts from all sources have been placed in this fund and accounted for as a unit. The practice has been to reappropriate any balance remaining in this fund at the end of the fiscal year and to add to that balance whatever new money was needed to meet the requirements during the next year. It is this system that Senate amendment No. 114 destroys. The attempted justification for this ill-considered blow at orderly administration is that by this move the Congress will be enabled to exercise more stringent control over the operations of the Authority. The sponsor of the amendment has stated that adoption of this amendment would in some mysterious way deprive the Authority of the right to use its current receipts for the payment of operating expenses. There is nothing in the amendment that accomplishes any such purpose. The right of the Authority to use its own receipts springs not from any language in the appropriation bill but from the clear grant of power contained in section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

That section confers upon the board of directors of the Authority the discretionary power to determine what part of the power revenues and other receipts of the Corporation shall be used for the following purposes: First, the operation of dams and reservoirs; second, conducting the business of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy; and, third, conducting the business of manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. So long as that section remains the law the board of directors has undoubted authority to utilize the receipts of the Corporation for any of those stated purposes. There is nothing in any of the Senate amendments before the conference committee that in any way affects that authority.

Statements that the T. V. A. accounts have never been audited are not in accord with the facts and record. From the very beginning the accounts of the T. V. A. have been audited by the General Accounting Office. The T. V. A. has

pursued the practice of having additional auditing of its funds by employing the services of a reputable accounting firm. Furthermore, in order to clear up some dispute as to procedure, and so forth, the present Comptroller General, who is one of the most able and distinguished men ever to serve in this honorable body, asked and received legislation at the hands of the Congress in November 1941 which has served to bring about an even more satisfactory and helpful procedure for the auditing of the T. V. A. funds.

In view of the foregoing, I sincerely hope the House will agree to the motion made by the chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY IS A WAR AGENCY MAKING A VITAL AND INDISPENSIBLE CONTRIBUTION IN THE DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY—IT SHOULD NOT BE HAMPERED, HOBLED, OR CRIPPLED IN THE CONTRIBUTION THAT IT IS MAKING FOR VICTORY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the question presented on the Senate amendment to the provisions the House made for the Tennessee Valley Authority in this bill presents this question for our determination: Shall we utilize to the fullest extent the Tennessee Valley Authority and the power which it is producing in our war efforts?

It is not a question of whether, in the first instance, you might or might not favor the Tennessee Valley Authority as an original proposition. It is an accomplished fact. The Tennessee Valley Authority is a Government corporation, the instrumentality, the organization through which the people of the United States are operating the greatest public-owned, coordinated power system in the world. All of the dams, the two great steam-generating plants, all of the transmission lines, all of the other properties involved, are owned by the people of the United States. Title to these properties is in the United States of America.

The Senate, by its amendment, deprives the Tennessee Valley Authority of its revolving fund, deprives it of the right to use in this hour of emergency, in the vigorous, uninterrupted production of power, which is in turn used for the production of war materials—

any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942, and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), and prevents these funds from being covered into and accounted for as one fund, to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943.

As the result of the removal of these provisions for the benefit of the Tennessee Valley Authority from the act now being considered the Tennessee Valley Authority is denied the right, in time of war, to use these funds as it has heretofore used them in times of peace. Under the act, as amended, these funds are no longer available for the payment of its current expenses, and are no longer available to meet an emergency.

Let us see what this means. The Tennessee Valley Authority now has in ac-

tive operation and is now producing power at 10 great dams and at 2 steam plants. It has just closed 2 great storage dams and it has under construction 8 additional dams for the production of power.

Size of present Tennessee Valley Authority system.

The installed capacity of the T. V. A. system is, as of June 4, 1942, 1,325,000 kilowatts. Over seven and one-half billion kilowatt-hours of energy will be supplied in the current fiscal year over more than 5,150 miles of high-voltage transmission lines which carry the power from the generating plants to major distribution points throughout the area. Two hundred and fifty-two substations operated by the Authority make this power available to customers at distribution voltages.

More than 1,700 persons are employed in the operation and maintenance of these facilities alone.

At the present time there are 147 men patrolling the more than 5,000 miles of transmission lines owned and operated by the Authority. These men are constantly engaged in line switching, in maintenance work, and in guarding this great transmission system against breakdown through accident or sabotage.

More than 2,500,000 people in parts of 6 States are wholly dependent upon electricity from the T. V. A. system, and many essential war-production industries rely on it for power and for their continuous operation.

Within a radius of 75 miles of the city of Knoxville the Tennessee Valley Authority is furnishing indispensable electrical energy to the Aluminum Co. of America, at Alcoa, where 70 percent of the aluminum used in our fighting aircraft is manufactured, and where more than 11,000 men are employed. At Copper Hill and at Ducktown, in Polk County, Tenn., the Tennessee Copper Co. employs thousands of men producing vast quantities of copper and acid for use in our war efforts. At Mascot, in Knox County, Tenn., and at New Market and at Jefferson City, in Jefferson County, Tenn., the American Zinc Co. and other zinc companies are producing vast quantities of zinc. Within this radius the Fulton-Sylphon Co., of Knoxville, Tenn., is producing vital war supplies, without which our submarines could not operate and without which our offensive forces would be without depth bombs. All of these plants and scores of other plants in this area engaged in the production of munitions and supplies of war obtain the electrical energy, without which they could not operate one day, from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The continued uninterrupted operation of these plants is vital to our victory. A little more than a year ago, by sabotage, on three different occasions, the transmission lines and towers over which and by means of which the Tennessee Copper Co. was supplied with electric energy were dynamited. This sabotage may be repeated by enemies within our border. It may be carried to us by the enemy through bombing from the air. If, through any unforeseen disaster, it becomes necessary to rebuild or to re-

pair the far-flung facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, it must have the money available with which to do it without the delay incident to coming to Congress for an authorization and for an appropriation.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is just as much an instrumentality of warfare as are our war craft now plowing the waves of the seven seas and as our aircraft which have just dealt out defeat and destruction to the Japanese at Midway.

This amendment, which we are now proposing to get rid of, denies the T. V. A. the right to use these funds to carry on its work—to perform its mission.

This is wartime—when an assault from the enemy from the air, when by sabotage the lines, substations, dams, and generating plants of the T. V. A. may be wrecked—and this is no time to tie the hands of the Authority.

The enactment of the Senate amendment would stand as the last expression of the legislative will and would shackle, in my opinion, the war efforts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and it should be eliminated from the bill.

I sincerely hope that the membership of this House, without regard to party lines, will stand firmly in favor of the provisions of the act as originally written and adopted by this House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the position of the House conferees on the T. V. A. amendments in the conference report will be sustained. The language and the procedure contained in the original House bill follow in exact terms and principle the system under which the T. V. A. has been operating for a number of years. I have recently examined independent offices appropriation bills for the past 4 or 5 years. The Appropriation Committees and the officials of the Bureau of the Budget and of the Treasury felt that the T. V. A. could most effectively operate under the terms of the language as originally written by the House in this appropriation bill. The same procedure has been followed for a number of years. I can see no earthly reason for changing this arrangement. This system insures a continuity of electrical supply by the T. V. A., and if it is to continue to fill the place contemplated in our war effort and if it is to continue to be a great national asset, it must be guaranteed a continuity of operation. If it is placed on a year-to-year basis, which is contemplated by the Senate amendment, then certainly it cannot fulfill its full purpose. No industry or munitions plant would feel justified in making a contract with the T. V. A. for electrical energy unless such plant could be assured that the T. V. A. would be able to supply the needed power on a continuing basis.

There is absolutely nothing in the record to show justification for the Senate amendment. The T. V. A. is successfully furnishing power to two and one-half million people in a large area of this country. Eighty percent of this power is

used directly by industries manufacturing munitions of war. Long-term contracts have been made. It would undermine the solemn obligations to change the provisions of law which might put the T. V. A. on a year-to-year basis.

T. V. A. has now been operating for 9 years. Its predictions as to the need for power supply have proved to be right. It has never failed to meet its promise to Congress as to when a dam would be completed. It has never spent more on a dam than it told Congress the project would cost. In fact, it is the one agency that has invariably bettered its commitments to Congress on the amount of time and funds required for construction.

The T. V. A. has consistently reduced its unit cost of operation and has drastically diminished from year to year its overhead administrative costs until they now stand at less than 4 percent, which is a remarkable record for any similar enterprise. The T. V. A. has been subjected to severe and thoroughgoing investigations, and no embezzlement, fraud, or mishandling of funds has ever been shown. The part it is playing in the war effort is creditable, and certainly during a time of war when the resources of this agency are being taxed to the limit, no change in its operation should be made unless a very good showing is made. No showing has been made. On the contrary the change would do the T. V. A. much harm.

A great deal has been said about the auditing and reporting of the affairs of the T. V. A. The Senate amendment of course has nothing to do with auditing, and I am advised that any substitute amendment dealing with this question would not be germane. But since the question has been raised, I think it fair to say that the T. V. A. has at all times been very open and full in making its reports to the public and has cooperated in every way possible in furnishing the General Accounting Office with such information as it may desire. I have recently had occasion to examine the annual reports of the T. V. A. for the years 1940 and 1941. These reports contain a very full commercial audit which gives the minutest details of the T. V. A.'s financial situation and of the way it has handled the public's money. Section 9 b of the T. V. A. Act authorizes the General Accounting Office to make an audit whenever it desires.

Shortly after the present Comptroller General assumed office a bill was filed in the House by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] which placed the T. V. A. under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act. The T. V. A., by virtue of the fact that it is operating a large utility where certain emergency expenditures are necessarily made, felt that it should be given some leeway in the operation of its business. The T. V. A. and the Comptroller General worked out a system which placed the T. V. A. under the Budget and Accounting Act, but at the same time gave the Authority certain latitude. This compromise was satisfactory to the Comptroller General and to the T. V. A. I am sure that it is working out satisfactorily at the present time. There is

nothing in the record to cause one to reach a different conclusion. This being the situation, I can see no reason why any thought should be given to changing the arrangement.

As a matter of fact most of the Government-owned corporations and some of the Government-owned agencies which are engaged in business, have wider latitude in the handling of their own affairs than does the T. V. A. Undoubtedly this is necessary because frequently situations must be met immediately; contracts must be entered into to meet an emergency; and therefore, some latitude must be given such agencies.

I wish to call your attention to parts of the acts describing the latitude given other agencies in the handling of their affairs, and by comparison it will be seen that the T. V. A. is more restricted than most of them. In 1933, the Congress enacted this authority for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation:

The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails for its official business in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government, and shall determine its necessary expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, without regard to the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds.

The Employees' Compensation Commission, act of June 5, 1924:

In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the finding of facts in, and the decision of the Commission upon, the merits of any claim presented under or authorized by this act if supported by competent evidence shall not be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States.

The Federal Housing Administration, act of June 27, 1934:

The Administrator may delegate any of the functions and powers conferred upon him under this title and titles II and III to such officers, agents, and employees as he may designate or appoint, and may make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks and books of reference, and for paper, printing, and binding) as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and titles II and III, without regard to any other provisions of law governing the expenditure of public funds.

Act of September 1, 1937, United States Housing Authority:

Such financial transactions of the Authority as the making of loans, annual contributions, and capital grants, and the acquisition, sale, exchange, lease, or other disposition of real and personal property, and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such financial transactions of the Authority shall be audited by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation prescribe.

Veterans' Administration, act of October 17, 1940:

Sec. 11. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, except as provided in section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and in section 817 (617) of the

National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, the decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on any question of law or fact concerning a claim for benefits or payments under this or any other act administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such decisions.

Soil Conservation, act of February 16, 1938:

Sec. 385. The facts constituting the basis for any Soil Conservation Act payment, parity payment, or loan, or the amount thereof, when officially determined in conformity with the applicable regulations prescribed by the Secretary or by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be reviewable by any other officer or agency of the Government.

World War Adjusted Compensation Act, section 310, July 3, 1926:

Sec. 310. The decisions of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director, on all matters within their respective jurisdictions under the provisions of this act (except the duties vested in them by title VII) shall be final and conclusive.

For the United States Maritime Commission, the following:

Sec. 207. The Commission may enter into such contracts, upon behalf of the United States, and may make such disbursements as may, in its discretion, be necessary to carry on the activities authorized by this act, or to protect, preserve, or improve the collateral held by the Commission to secure indebtedness, in the same manner that a private corporation may contract within the scope of the authority conferred by its charter. * * * *Provided*, That it shall be recognized that, because of the business activities authorized by this act, the accounting officers shall allow credit for all expenditures shown to be necessary because of the nature of such authorized activities, notwithstanding any existing statutory provisions to the contrary.

The T. V. A. has always pursued the course set for it by Congress. The fact that the Comptroller General who has been continuously auditing the books of the T. V. A. has not reported any irregularities, indicates conclusively that there are none. Why, then, should the arrangement which is generally satisfactory be upset? It would only lead to uncertainty and harm to our war effort and to the future service of one of the finest enterprises owned by the people of the United States. I sincerely ask you to stand behind the committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if he thinks additional legislation should be enacted in order that the Tennessee Valley and the General Accounting Office may iron out any differences that now exist, in order that the accounts of the T. V. A. will come under the General Accounting Office, just as those of all other departments of the Government should, so that the House of Representatives can feel sure that under the supervision Lindsay Warren would give it every dollar that is appropriated for this item of expenses or any other item will be handled in a proper way?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that under the act we passed November 21, 1941, we defined the powers of the General Accounting Office with reference to the rendition and settlement of accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. This act was passed after a great deal of consideration in both branches of the Congress. It was for the purpose of doing just what the gentleman has in mind, and what I have always felt should be done, to have the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority carefully scrutinized by the General Accounting Office. That is being done now. There is not a complete audit, but a system of audit is set up under this act of November 21, 1941, and I am told that it is entirely satisfactory to the Comptroller General. As far as I am concerned, I feel that that is as far as we can or should undertake to go right now, when the Tennessee Valley Authority is one of the very important war agencies. None of us wants to do anything that will interfere with it in its war effort.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I just came on the floor from a committee meeting and do not quite understand what the proposal here is. I understand that the gentleman has made a motion to insist on the position of the House with respect to the McKellar amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. What does the McKellar amendment provide, generally speaking?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The McKellar amendment, generally speaking, undertook to repeal the organic law which permitted the Tennessee Valley Authority to have the use of its receipts, but the parliamentary situation was such that the effect of the McKellar amendment was not to do that but to give them an additional \$36,000,000, and they would also have been permitted to continue to use their receipts as a rotating fund. It got into such a shape that the objective of the McKellar amendment would not have been carried out under the parliamentary situation, even if everyone had agreed that that was the thing to do.

Mr. MAY. As chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, in which the Tennessee Valley Authority legislation originated, and through which it has all come, particularly the legislation of 1941, when the question arose as to whether or not they should be controlled by the Accounting Office, I may say that we had quite extensive hearings on that question and the representatives of this agency were perfectly arbitrary and resistant to the proposal. They said their affairs ought not to be audited by anybody, that their accounts ought not to be subject to supervision except in their own agency, and that they ought to be permitted to spend any money they got hold of from their returns from any source just as they pleased.

Of course, as a legislator responsible to the people of my section of the country I am interested in knowing whether

or not there is going to be some fair provision put in the appropriation bill, either to broaden or limit the functions and authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and if there is I think it should go through the legislative committee which has created this authority and has studied the proposition.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the position which the conferees took, that it is a matter that the legislative committee ought to consider rather than try to work it out piecemeal fashion in an appropriation bill.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. To further emphasize the matter, and for the encouragement of the House, will the gentleman restate the expenditures in full as well as the full amount of receipts of the T. V. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know that I clearly understand what the gentleman wants to know. Does the gentleman want to know the amount of money involved as the appropriation for T. V. A.?

Mr. GIFFORD. What does it cost us this year, and what will be their receipts?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is estimated that approximately \$36,000,000 will be available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1943 from receipts from their power and fertilizer operations.

Mr. GIFFORD. What are their total receipts from power and other things?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amount I have just stated, \$36,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. GIFFORD. What is their expense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, their expense has been a tremendous construction program and they are just now getting to the point where they are having large sales of power, hence the interest in the disposition of their receipts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman himself feels somewhat encouraged that the receipts sometime will very nearly reach the outgo?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That would involve considerable optimism, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I think much encouragement can be had from the fact that the receipts will amount to \$36,000,000, and undoubtedly are going to increase very much from year to year.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman understands my question is asked because I am seeking encouragement in the matter for the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I can offer the gentleman some degree of encouragement, I will say to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Simply for the purpose of keeping the record straight, the total receipts for power sales were \$36,938,000 and \$1,411,112 from miscella-

neous revenue, from which there must be deducted \$2,229,000 for interdepartmental sales. So they have an available balance of \$36,120,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 115: On page 75, line 12, after the word "Statute", insert: "Provided, That the sum of not less than \$20,000,000 from the said construction fund shall be available for the construction of towboats and barges adapted for use in the transportation of oil, gasoline, fuels, and other commodities over the inland or coastal waters of the United States."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. I want to say to the gentleman that I think the committee should agree to this amendment because it is going to do what many of the Members have discussed from time to time about the construction of these barges in order that they may transport oil and gasoline along the intercoastal waterways. I think it would be a wise move to agree to this provision.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It may be a wise policy, I will say to the gentleman; but I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language put in by the Senate is merely permissive. It permits the Maritime Commission to do something that they already have the power to do, but it is really a function of the Office of Defense Transportation. That is the situation in a nutshell. We have set up a special agency for defense transportation and it is peculiarly their function to provide for this barge transportation, and it is not the function of the Maritime Commission to do it. The Maritime Commission has a letter which I wish the gentleman would refer to. It is in the Record of May 6, at page 3995, a letter from Admiral Land, in which he states he does not think the Maritime Commission should be further burdened with this matter when it is peculiarly the function of the Office of Defense Transportation.

Mr. RICH. I understood from a reading of the amendment that it was for the construction of these barges and that their operation might be under any other organization. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It calls for the construction of these boats, and it is merely permissive language, and does not compel anybody to do anything. There is a right way to do it, and it is not the right way to put it in this bill in this way.

Mr. RICH. I believe it ought to be handled in this way, but if you gentlemen who have gone into the matter

think otherwise, we are willing to trust your best judgment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am in thorough accord with the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It does not make any difference whether this is permissive or not. I do not see why in the name of heaven the Maritime Commission should be objecting to some permissive authority. If the question is one of conflict between them and Eastman's administration and others, in the name of heaven why can they not get together and settle that conflict? I have no sympathy with the position taken by the Maritime Commission in connection with this item.

Mr. RICH. And if we adopted this amendment now, we would get these barges constructed at once?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no. That is the point. We would not get them constructed at once, because the Maritime Commission does not think they ought to build them.

Mr. BLAND. And if the Congress thinks so, why in the name of heaven cannot the Commission bow to the will of Congress?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the Congress think so, the Congress ought to pass a substantive act, and not play with the matter by making a permissive amendment in respect to it.

Mr. BLAND. If there is a conflict between these two agencies, and authority is given, then, cannot they be gotten together possibly by the President of the United States and resolve their difficulties?

Mr. RICH. Would it not be a wise thing to ask somebody in authority to go ahead and direct this Commission to do that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If this motion prevails, the matter goes back to conference again, and we will give it further consideration.

Mr. RICH. We have faith in what the gentleman from Virginia is trying to do, and I hope the gentleman will get action upon it, because if we are going to have action, we should get it at once.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want to ask this question. As I understand it, it is the intention of the committee that \$20,000,000 shall be available for the construction of towboats, barges, for the transportation of oil and gasoline, fuels, and other commodities over the inland or coastal waterways in the United States. What effect upon the use of that money for that purpose will the adoption of the gentleman's position have?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Senate inserted an amendment such as the gentleman has indicated, making \$20,000,000 of the funds of the Maritime Commission available for the purpose which the gentleman has indicated. The Maritime Commission objects to that for

two reasons. In the first place, they have not got \$20,000,000 that they can devote to that. Their funds are allocated for a shipbuilding program, and we are continually being called upon for more funds by the Maritime Commission. The second reason is that the Maritime Commission, according to the letter they have inserted in the Record under date of May 6, at page 3995, say that if the policy is to be inaugurated, it ought to be inaugurated and set into motion by the Office of Defense Transportation, that they have jurisdiction of it, and that the Maritime Commission already has more than it can do and ought not to be further saddled with the matter of building and operating barges. It may be that this is the right thing to do, but if it is, it ought to be given to the agencies that we set up for that purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Regardless of the controversy that exists between the two agencies, as to which one shall control the appropriation, it is the province of Congress to indicate its desire that \$20,000,000 shall be used for this purpose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What effect will the adoption of the gentleman's motion have upon the indication which Congress has made?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Congress has made no such indication.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I refer to the indication implicit in this amendment, that it is desired that \$20,000,000 be used for this purpose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the motion that I have made is adopted, the amendment will still be in disagreement, and it will go back to a further conference.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Without instructions?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Without instructions.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And without any indication from the House as to how the conferees shall proceed?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the conferees as well as most Members of the House who have expressed themselves feel that there is much merit in the use of these barges. I would personally hope that a proper program should be agreed upon between these two agencies.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It would seem to me at this time, when transportation is of such importance, that \$20,000,000 should be used for the construction of these barges, and I hope the gentleman may have that in mind.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think that is true. I would like to see a direct appropriation of that amount of money made to some agency and specific authority given, and not approach it indirectly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman probably is not aware of the fact that there has been a great deal of difficulty with the defense transportation group in getting adequate facilities for the inland waterways. It is only natural,

of course, that those in charge of the defense transportation are more friendly to railroad transportation than they are to river transportation. I think it would be very advisable to retain this provision in the bill so that there would be some definite indication on the part of Congress that we want to get these additional facilities for water transportation, and thereby bring the supplies that we need into this and other sections of the country.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sure the conferees are glad to have had these expressions from Members of the House. If this motion is adopted we will go back to conference and see what we can do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I do not know of anyone that we have any more confidence in than the gentleman from Virginia. If he finds that this is going to give us immediate construction, then I hope the committee will act in that manner, in order that we may get them at the quickest possible moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there any case of record where the Maritime Commission has ever built and operated barges?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot answer that. My colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND, probably can tell you.

Mr. BLAND. Not on inland waterways, as far as I can recall. The barges or boats on the Warrior River system, I think, was an independent operation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me the gentleman is sound in the position he has taken. We should keep them out of the Maritime Commission. It is a technical problem and I do not think the Maritime Commission should be brought into that field at all.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We will do what we can and see what we can work out of it.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Government does operate barges on the Mississippi River.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a special set-up. It is not the Maritime Commission, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

SILVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, one chief newspaper read by the Members of Congress and the members of our Government, the Washington Post, in editorial this morning gives a Tip for Congress, heading a long article against the administration's silver-purchase program. Day after day this paper and many leading publications of the country subject the people and the Congress to a barrage of propaganda of misrepresentation concerning the use of silver as money. What is the reason? I have studied this question and I presented the reason for this vicious campaign in my reply to the 65 economists made on the floor of the House yesterday which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning. I hope every Member of both branches of Congress will read it and get the facts.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman favor increasing the price of silver?

Mr. WHITE. If we could permit the law of supply and demand to play the price of silver would rise—the price of silver is in a vise and has been for a long time. I did not know of this situation until a friend of mine tried to buy \$40,000 worth for commercial purposes. I tried everywhere to help him but you cannot buy silver at any price. I have the telegrams and letters from the big silver dealers to prove this fact. The price of foreign silver in this country is rigidly controlled.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 16, 24, 29, 30, 32, 34, 49, 52, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 69, 70, 75, 77, and 92.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 39, 53, 55, 59, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 72, 73, 78, 80, 82, 84, 89, 94, 98, 99, 100, 103, and 104, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for State and county land-use planning"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$242,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$301,403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,133,110"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$323,733"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$897,484"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$382,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$374,395"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,142,239"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,785,512"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,339,429"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$22,427,204"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"Sec. 4. Of the total amount available under this Act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the sum of \$1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this Act below the Budget estimates."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 31, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 79, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, and 102.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. McNARY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Correction of totals, allocations, etc.

The following amendments are in adjustment of totals, allocations, clarifications of text, etc.: Nos. 4, 8, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 37, 51, 52, 66, 71, 73, 76, 80, 82, and 100.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1 relating to the prohibition against predictions or forecasts with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same: The Senate proposes to permit forecasts "as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests", to which the House agrees.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 3, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated \$290,144; the Senate, \$400,144; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 5, display of exhibits at State and other fairs: The House allotted \$70,832; the Senate, \$60,832; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7, printing and binding: The House appropriated \$1,000,000; the Senate, \$1,300,000; the House recedes.

Special research fund, Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 13, removal of soybean chemical investigations from Urbana, Ill., to Peoria, Ill.: The Senate struck out the House provision for the removal to the Northern Regional Laboratory at Peoria, Ill., of the chemical phases of the soybean investigations heretofore conducted at Urbana, Ill.; the Senate recedes.

Extension Service

Amendment No. 16, Puerto Rico: The House appropriated \$100,000; the Senate, \$128,000; the Senate recedes.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 20, agricultural program formulation: The Senate inserted a limitation prohibiting the use of the appropriation for

cooperative agricultural program formulation, to which the House agrees with a clarifying amendment limiting the prohibition to work at the State and county levels.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 22, animal husbandry: The Senate provided an increase of \$16,920, to which the House agrees. The poultry experiment station at Glendale, Ariz., is restored in the sum of \$13,500, and the beef cattle management investigations at Ardmore, S. Dak., are restored in the sum of \$3,420.

Amendment No. 25, diseases of animals: The Senate reduced the allocation for swine erysipelas in the sum of \$8,500, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 26, eradicating cattle ticks: The House appropriated \$270,000; the Senate, \$276,000; the House recedes.

Bureau of Dairy Industry

Amendment No. 30, studies of dairy herd improvement records: The House made a cut of \$20,000 in the Budget increase of \$40,320; the Senate restored \$15,000 of the cut; the Senate recedes.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 32, bindweed and other noxious weeds: The House provided \$25,000; the Senate, \$37,685; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 33, forage crops and diseases: The Senate provided an increase of \$50,000 for turf-grass investigations, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 34, forest pathology: The House appropriated \$15,000 for sap-stain-control investigations, which the Senate struck out. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 35, plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: The House appropriated \$293,903; the Senate, \$308,903; the conference report provides \$301,403.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 39, forest influences: The House appropriated \$124,350; the Senate, \$133,000. The House recedes as to the amount appropriated; the Senate recedes from its cut of \$350 in the allocation to the station at Iron Forks, Ark.

Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50, agricultural engineering investigations: The Senate provided an increase of \$10,000 for prevention and control of dust explosions and fires, from which it recedes; the Senate provided an increase of \$5,000 for rural-electrification investigations relating to the developing of low-cost egg coolers on the farm, to which the House agrees.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendment No. 53, fruit insects: The Senate provided increases totaling \$23,345 for work on pecan insects, peach insects, and grape insects, and a decrease of \$5,000 for Japanese-beetle investigations, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 54, Japanese-beetle control: The House appropriated \$82,275; the Senate, \$432,275; the conference report provides \$382,275.

Amendment No. 55, Japanese-beetle control: The Senate inserted a provision prohibiting the use of the appropriation to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed, to which the House agrees.

Amendments Nos. 56, 57, 58, and 61, gypsy and brown-tail moth control, Dutch elm disease eradication, phony peach and peach mosaic eradication, and barberry eradication: The action of the conferees on these amendments disallows the Senate increases for technical supervision of W. P. A. employees assigned to these projects. The cost of such supervision has heretofore been paid from the respective Federal W. P. A. allotments. It is the opinion of the con-

ferrees that work of this type, which was begun under relief appropriations, should not be transferred to the regular departmental appropriations, but that, if it is to be continued as an emergency matter, consideration thereof should be accorded in connection with further relief appropriations or other legislation.

Amendment No. 59, forest insects: The Senate provided an increase of \$15,000 for continuation of studies on insect vectors of the Dutch elm disease, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 60, cereal and forage insects: The Senate provided an increase of \$50,000, of which \$40,000 was for strengthening the investigations on the European corn borer and \$10,000 for continuation of studies on the Mormon cricket. The conference report provides an increase of \$25,000 for these two investigations.

Amendment No. 61, barberry eradication: See amendments Nos. 56, 57, 58, and 61, above.

Amendment No. 62, cotton insects: The House appropriated \$123,895; the Senate, \$148,439; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 63, bee culture: The House appropriated \$75,100; the Senate, \$82,100; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 64, insects affecting man and animals: The Senate provided an increase of \$6,000 for investigations of the Clear Lake gnat at Clear Lake, Calif. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 65, foreign plant quarantines: The House appropriated \$716,300; the Senate, \$719,550; the House recedes.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 67, Cotton Quality Statistics and Classing Acts: The Senate provided an increase of \$10,000, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 68, United States Cotton Futures and United States Cotton Standards Act: The Senate restored a Budget cut of \$15,000, to which the House agrees. This will provide the same amount for the fiscal year 1943 as is appropriated for the fiscal year 1942.

Amendment No. 69, United States Warehouse Act: The House appropriated \$456,415; the Senate, \$481,415; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 70, Packers and Stockyards Act: The House appropriated \$389,544; the Senate, \$397,665; the Senate recedes.

Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act

Amendment No. 72, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated \$569,587; the Senate, \$469,587; the House recedes.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 74, Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: The House appropriated \$1,314,429; the Senate, \$1,364,429; the conference report provides \$1,339,429.

Amendment No. 75, Soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: The House appropriated \$20,510,812; the Senate, \$19,510,812; the Senate recedes.

Agricultural conservation program payments

Amendment No. 77, the so-called Andrews amendment: The Senate inserted a provision requiring that seed purchased for delivery to farmers for use in connection with soil conservation compliances be bought through regular seed dealer channels except where such sources are not available. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 78, limitation of \$1,000 on payments to any one person or corporation: The House inserted a provision limiting agricultural conservation payments to \$1,000. The Senate struck out the provision, to which the House agrees.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 84, relating to commodities for the manufacture of which grain may be sold below the parity price: The House provided that grain may be sold below parity for the manufacture of "alcohol." The Senate struck out "alcohol" and inserted in lieu thereof the words "ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber", to which the House agrees.

International production control committees

Amendment No. 89: The Senate inserted a new item authorizing the expenditure of \$17,500 from funds available to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the share of the United States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like bodies, to which the House agrees.

Land utilization and retirement of submarginal lands

Amendment No. 92: The House appropriated \$1,591,182; the Senate, \$795,575; the Senate recedes.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation

Amendment No. 94, migratory labor camps: The House made no appropriation; the Senate appropriated \$1,400,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 98, maximum loan to any individual farmer: The House provided \$1,000; the Senate, \$2,500; the House recedes.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 99, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated \$3,750,000; the Senate, \$3,500,000; the House recedes.

Requirement of affidavit by employees

Amendment No. 103: The Senate inserted a provision exempting persons employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property from the requirement to make affidavits of nonmembership in organizations advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, to which the House agrees.

Travel expenses

Amendment No. 104: The Senate struck out the House provision limiting travel expense to \$8,000,000, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 105: The Senate inserted the following:

"Sec. 4. Of the total amount available under this Act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the sum of \$1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this Act below the Budget estimates."

The conference report strikes out the Senate language and inserts in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 4. Of the total amount available under this act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the sum of \$1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this act below the Budget estimates."

Amendments in disagreement

The committee of conference failed to reach any agreement as to the following amendments:

Totals, allocations, clarifications of text, etc.

The following amendments relate to the adjustment of totals, allocations, clarifications of text, etc.: Nos. 11, 12, 17, 18, 21, 36, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48 and 93.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 2: Fixes the salary of the Solicitor at \$9,200. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment fixing the salary at \$9,000.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 6: Permits the reimbursement of the appropriation on account of duplicating and photographic work done for the other bureaus and offices of the Department from the appropriations of such bureaus current at the time such work is done. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10, title I, Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates \$2,463,708, instead of \$2,263,708 as proposed by the House, and provides that \$63,708 shall be so allotted as to prevent any State or Territory from receiving less than it received in the fiscal year 1942. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15, additional cooperative extension work: Appropriate \$555,000 instead of \$203,000 as proposed by the House, and is for the purpose of preventing certain of the States and Territories from receiving allotments reduced in amount on account of change in the plan of allotment from a rural population basis to a farm population basis, or on account of relative reduction in population as evidenced by the Census of 1940 compared with the Census of 1930. The managers on the part of the House will move to concur.

Bureau of Agricultural Economies

Amendment No. 19, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$778,798, instead of \$278,798 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$572,580, instead of \$575,475 as proposed by the House. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur with an amendment fixing the amount of the appropriation at \$579,895. This will be for the purpose of restoring \$20,000, proposed by the House and stricken out by the Senate, for hybrid corn investigations in the South; it will accept the Senate increase of \$4,420 for seed flax investigations, and will eliminate the Senate increase of \$12,685 for investigations of bindweed and other noxious weeds.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 38, national forest protection and management: Provides an increase of \$3,000,000 to strengthen forest fire control and an increase of \$20,000 for expansion of recreational facilities at Mount Charleston near Las Vegas, Nev.

Amendment No. 42, forest-fire cooperation: Appropriates \$5,000,000, instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Forest roads and trails

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$7,500,000, instead of \$6,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Agricultural conservation program payments

Amendment No. 79: Provides that tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government who comply with the program shall be entitled to the same payments for such compliance as other producers. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur.

Parity payments

Amendment No. 81: Provides that the agricultural conservation payments shall be taken into account and added to the farmer's market returns in determining the

amount of the parity payment to which he may be entitled.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 83, relating to Government-controlled stocks of grain which may be sold for less than parity for feeding purposes or for manufacture of alcohol, etc.: The House provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality and is sold for feeding purposes or the manufacture of alcohol"; while the Senate provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality or is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of certain industrial alcohols, acetone, and rubber. The question of merit in the Senate amendment lies in its substitution of the word "or" for the word "and".

Amendment No. 85: The Senate proposes that not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat be sold for feeding purposes.

Amendment No. 86: The Senate proposes that "no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 per centum of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities

Amendments Nos. 87 and 88: Strikes out the House language authorizing the use of \$775,000 for administrative expenses and inserts language reappropriating the unexpended balance (estimated to be approximately \$44,500,000) of the funds made available for the purposes of "section 32" for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. These amendments involve the school-lunch program, the food stamp plan, etc.

Farm Tenant Act

Amendment No. 90, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,000,000, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91, loans: Authorizes \$40,000,000, instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation

Amendment No. 95, rehabilitation services and assistance: Appropriates \$50,319,557, instead of \$25,319,557 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96, loans: Authorizes \$125,000,000, instead of \$70,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 97, land-purchase program: Authorizes the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942.

Interchange of appropriations

Amendments Nos. 101 and 102: Authorizes interchange within bureaus of not to exceed 10 per centum, instead of not to exceed 5 per centum of the amounts appropriated as proposed by the House; and authorizes the addition of not more than 10 per centum to any one item, instead of not more than 5 per centum as proposed by the House.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate adopted 105 amendments to the Agriculture Appropriation bill. The pending conference report represents the agreement of the conferees of the two bodies on, as I recall, 54 of those amendments. In part, agreement has been reached so far as the conferees are concerned, on other

amendments where because of the parliamentary rules it is necessary that the amendments be brought back to the House and motions made to recede and concur in the Senate action. Certain other amendments which are reported in disagreement have relation to totals, and action upon them will follow whatever disposition is made of the amendments which are really in controversy.

The amendments relating to the increases provided for the Forest Service, for the Farm Security Administration, and relating to the limitation provided by the House upon the administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the amendments of the Senate to the parity provisions of the bill, with the sole exception of the one relating to the use of grains in the manufacture of ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, and acetone for rubber, are in disagreement. There are, however, only some six or seven items of major disagreement.

The appropriations carried in the bill, insofar as the conferees of the two Houses have been able to reach agreement and as represented by the position of the managers on the part of the House as to amendments in disagreement are substantially below the figures of the bill as it passed the Senate.

The clerk of the subcommittee has not yet been able to complete his computation to show exactly the amount by which the conference report and motions to be offered by House managers would reduce the amounts allowed in the Senate bill in connection with these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Clerk relative to that subject matter after the statement has been completed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The conference report involves a net increase of \$1,449,636 above the amount of the bill as it passed the Senate, due to the fact that the Senate had made reductions in House items totaling \$1,810,607, which were restored in conference. Offsetting the foregoing items, the Senate conferees receded from several increases, totaling \$360,971.

Should the House agree to the motions of its managers respecting the Senate amendments still in disagreement, there will be a net reduction under Senate figures, covering the entire bill, of \$29,991,049 in appropriations from the Treasury and a reduction of \$55,000,000 in loan authorizations.

Mr. TARVER. The amendments which have been agreed upon and with relation to which a complete statement is made in the conference report do not as a rule involve the expenditure of a very considerable amount of funds; many of them are of a very minor nature. The House Membership has had opportunity to examine the conference report and to advise itself as to the action which has been taken by the conferees. It would be a fruitless matter for me to undertake to discuss in detail all of the 54 amendments with regard to which agreement has been reached, and I shall not undertake to do so, but

at this time desire to offer to answer to the best of my ability any question which may be propounded by the members of the committee with reference to those amendments. I hope that the gentlemen at this time will not interrogate me with reference to the amendments which are in disagreement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to ask the gentleman about amendment No. 94, which deals with migratory labor camps. This is a matter in which certain sections of the country, notably my own, are at present very seriously concerned because of the shortage of agricultural labor. We ought especially to have mobile labor camps and to have enough money to operate the camps that are already constructed. It seems to us in California a very important thing that sufficient funds be provided for this purpose. I notice that the conferees have agreed to grant really the Senate appropriation, which is \$1,400,000, and I thank the conferees for so doing; but the question I desired to ask the gentleman is whether he thinks this amount will in the long run be sufficient to take care of this problem.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will no doubt recall that on the passage of the bill through the House I undertook to sustain the action taken by the subcommittee insofar as I could do so by argument.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do remember that.

Mr. TARVER. The House disagreed with the position of the gentleman and with the position of myself. The Senate by amendment provided \$1,400,000 for the operation and maintenance of existing migratory labor camps. The House conferees could go no further.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand.

Mr. TARVER. We agreed to the increase over the figures in the House bill suggested by the Senate. This is done in the conference report.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to know if the Clerk has had sufficient time to compute the total as carried in the House bill and compare it to the increases which the other body added so as to give us a picture of the difference in the two bills?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman evidently did not hear my statement a few moments ago when I asked permission to insert that in the RECORD as soon as it is prepared by the Clerk.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. My question has to do with the Bureau of Plant Industry, under

vegetables and fruits. I understand that the amounts appropriated for potato breeding and onion breeding, or rather for research in those two fields, are the same as were allowed in the House bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. TARVER. To what amendment does the gentleman refer?

Mr. TALLE. I believe the House figures are intact. I want to be sure no changes have been made, and I see no amendment in the conference report that would indicate changes in the two items involved.

Mr. TARVER. If there is no amendment, of course, the provisions remain as in the House bill.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentleman for his assurance that these figures remain intact.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. May I inquire if the gentleman has touched on the question of the wheat storage proposition?

Mr. TARVER. No. There is nothing in the conference report involving that problem, as far as I know.

Mr. HAINES. I thought the gentleman was taking up this conference report as it relates to wheat stocks.

Mr. TARVER. No. The gentleman has reference to the limitation proposed in the House bill on the sale of Government-owned commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That amendment is in disagreement and is not involved in the conference report. It will be taken up later.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I recall, the House wrote in a limitation of \$1,000 on conservation payments. My understanding is that the Senate struck out that limitation of a thousand dollars. If that is the case, we are back operating under the old law where we would have a limitation of only \$10,000; is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. The limitation provided in the House bill did not prevent the making of payments to landlords in excess of \$1,000 in cases where the landlords were operating a farm through tenants or sharecroppers and in connection with which operation they adopted methods determined by the local committees to be in accordance with fair and customary standards of renting and sharecropping prevailing in that locality. In other words, the House limitation was entirely without effect in the cases of landlords operating farms through tenants and sharecroppers where the landlord dealt fairly with the tenants.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

While the House limitation was not as far reaching as some of its advocates seemed to think it should have been, in the opinion of the House conferees, and even in the opinion of some of them who had supported the limitation in question, the subject matter is one which ought to be dealt with by legislation, amending

and revising legislation which is now on the statute books governing such payments and ought not to be handled or undertaken to be handled in an appropriation bill, and largely for that reason the House conferees have receded and agreed to the Senate amendment striking the limitation from the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are operating under the general law then of \$10,000?

Mr. TARVER. Under the statute law as it has existed prior to the passage of this bill by the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is a limitation of \$10,000?

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In amendments numbered 104 and 105 I understand the House has receded from the \$8,000,000 travel limitation and is recommending almost verbatim the Senate limitation which provides for a refund of only one and one-half million dollars in the travel account. That is on page 8 of the conference report. The parliamentary situation is such, is it not, that there can be no separate vote on this \$8,000,000 travel limitation that the House passed?

Mr. TARVER. No. Of course, the House could reject the conference report and send the whole matter back to conference, but there is no way under the rules of the House by which the gentleman could get a vote on that particular amendment alone.

May I say to the gentleman with reference to that amendment that, of course, the members of the subcommittee on appropriations and the conferees on the part of the House in connection with this bill have appreciated the gentleman's interest in undertaking to reduce the travel-expense item in the Department of Agriculture. The effect of the gentleman's amendment, however, which was adopted on the floor of the House, while it would have restricted to \$8,000,000 the amount of expenditure of appropriations carried in the bill for travel expenses would not have reduced the amount appropriated in the bill by one single penny. It would have left the amount carried in the bill for travel expenses in the appropriation for the various bureaus and divisions of the Department, and those amounts might have been spent by the administrative authorities for other purposes. The amendment of the gentleman made no reduction whatever in the total of the amount appropriated in the bill.

The Senate amendment does effect such a reduction. It effects a reduction not only of \$1,500,000 in travel expenses but, in addition to that, amounts resulting from reductions in amounts available for travel expenses in decreases in appropriations made to the various bureaus and divisions of the Department. Our clerks who made some investigation of the subject matter advised us that the amount of the reduction provided in the Senate amendment in travel expenses for the Department will be approximately \$2,100,000, \$600,000 in excess of the \$1,500,000 which is specifically stated

in the Senate amendment. So, whereas the amendment adopted in the House effected no saving whatever, the amendment adopted in the Senate, to which the House conferees have agreed, or recommended that the House agree, will effect a saving of \$2,100,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman advise me what the total travel expense will be approximately? My figures show there will still be about \$14,000,000 that will be left in the bill for the Department of Agriculture to spend in connection with its various travel activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I think that is probably true. I want to say this further, that in my judgment it is a very unwise thing to do merely to cut the travel expenses of the men who are hired to travel, such as men who carry on the Bang's disease and tuberculosis work in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and not cut out the positions of the men who are hired to travel and who cannot travel unless you provide them with the travel expenses. The only successful method of economy in that connection that I can conceive of would be that if you wished to deny to these employees the means by which they can travel, you ought to go further and cut out the jobs and cut out the money with which to pay their salaries. Simply to cut out their travel expenses and in effect provide that they could continue on the pay roll of the Government, continue to draw their salaries, and yet not be able to do any work to earn those salaries, is to my mind a rather foolish thing to do.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I notice that on amendment No. 24, the Andrews amendment, the Senate recedes.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is out of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. That is right, if the conference report is adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What will be the status with respect to the handling of seed, and what will be the policy of the Department with respect to the jobbers who deal in seed and who have complained that the Andrews amendment is necessary in order to protect them in their operations?

Mr. TARVER. The policy of the Department, I assume, will be what it has been heretofore. It has, as the gentleman knows, been a policy of allowing to seed dealers reasonable profits for handling these seeds in connection with the A. A. A. program. However, since the amendment is out of the bill and the Senate has receded with reference to it, I cannot conceive of any benefit from discussing the matter at length at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. What provision was made with regard to the Johnson amendment as to the \$1,000 limit, and the Hope amendment?

Mr. TARVER. I discussed that in answer to the question of the gentleman from Montana only a moment ago. I assume the gentleman was not on the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I was telephoning.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Did the conferees give any consideration to the question of permitting domestic wheat held by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used for milling purposes and export purposes?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that that is not involved in the conference report. It is involved in an amendment which is in disagreement and which will be called up for discussion after the conference report is acted upon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the bill passed the House it carried substantially \$648,000,000 for agriculture. The Senate added \$32,000,000, but some of those items will be diminished by action of the conference.

I think the gentleman from Georgia did an excellent job in conference. I think all of the Members of the House did an excellent job in conferring with the Senators, presenting our position, and standing pretty well by the House position. I want to pay testimony to the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, today for what I think was a very good job on the part of the House of Representatives.

Let me call your attention briefly to the approximately 14 substantial amendments that are in disagreement, other than amendments regarding legislative language. There is the one on experiment stations, which would provide an increase of \$200,000, written in by the Senate, which would give those States that would take smaller allotments by virtue of the 1940 census a diminution of what they received in 1942 and 1941.

Then there is the amendment on the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. You recall that on the House floor we chopped out \$1,050,000 for administrative expenses. The Senate restored \$500,000 of that amount, and that amendment is in disagreement at the present time.

The Senate also wrote in \$20,000 for recreational facilities at Mount Charleston in Nevada. It seems they have a magnesium plant out there, and about 35 miles away is this little mountain—if it is a mountain—with a forest on it. It is at an altitude of 6,000 or 7,000 feet. They thought they would build it up for recreational purposes. They wanted \$20,000, but they are going to use most of it for the purchase of toilet equipment, if you know what I mean, and some

2-inch pipe and 1-inch pipe, and a lot of other things. It occurs to me that it is, properly speaking, a job for the War Department, because it is more nearly germane to their activities than it is to those of the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service.

The Senate wrote in \$3,000,000 for emergency forest fire control. That amendment is in disagreement. They also wrote in \$2,500,000 for cooperative forest fire prevention. There is no authority in law for that increase today, and that was the House position in the course of the conference.

We gave the forest roads and trails item \$3,300,000, which was the Budget figure, in the House. The Senate increased that by \$1,000,000.

Then there is this rather troublesome question of including the so-called agricultural conservation payments as a part of the parity payments. An agreement was consummated last year by which they were so included. I do not know whether any informal agreement was particularly binding on the House of Representatives, although the House took that position last year, but it is in controversy at the present time and must be disposed of. My own personal idea is that they should not be so included.

The most controversial item, of course, is the language written in by the Senate with respect to the authority of Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grains below parity. There were several provisions proposed and the way the Senate set the thing up they cannot only sell for relief purposes, but they can sell deteriorated and nondeteriorated grain for alcohol, for butyl alcohol, for acetone for the manufacture of rubber, and for feed, and for a great many other items. My own opinion is if the House ever embraces that theory you have destroyed the farmer market. So we should stand by the House position, and return this amendment to conference for close study.

On surplus commodities the Senate increased the amount for school lunches by a substantial amount. They restored most of the things we deleted in respect of farm tenancy, rural rehabilitation, loans and grants, and increased the amount over the Budget figure. After the bill left the House there was a supplemental Budget estimate for a substantial amount. So the Senate granted part of that and restored the House cut and it is a rather substantial amount.

Finally, there is language in the bill which would put the seal of approval upon what the Farm Security Administration has done with respect to purchasing large blocks of land for the purpose of relocating farm families who have been dislocated as a result of Government acquisitions of land where defense projects were constructed. Of course, the action is illegal. It was illegal from the outset and if you adopt the Senate language it occurs to me, and I think to the other members of the conference, that we would be putting the stamp of approval on an illegal procedure which will involve in its total about \$23,000,000. That, too, is in disagreement.

I thought I would just give you a general, broad, and sketchy picture of the 14 basic amendments in disagreement at the present time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I was surprised at the gentleman's statement that the House conferees took the position that there was no authority of law for an appropriation of money for the strengthening of forest-fire control.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 1 additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For cooperative fire control in connection with State operations, and I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out in the statement that there was no legal authority for that item in the bill, an item of \$2,500,000.

Mr. TARVER. No authority for any amount exceeding the \$2,500,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I notice in amendment 31 there is \$20,000 included here for investigation in the South to increase the production of hybrid corn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there an equal amount to increase cotton and tobacco in the North, or are we left out?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I should say to my friend from Iowa, since he and I both come from the corn section, that they have got to develop special hybrid strains for States like Tennessee, Alabama, and elsewhere, and since the pioneer in the whole field embraces most of the country in the Corn Belt, at the present time I believe we should provide for further studies by the Department of Agriculture and I think this is a very proper item.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not think so.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 7, line 18, after the word "Solicitor", insert "including salary of the Solicitor at \$9,200 per annum, and."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment, insert "including salary of the Solicitor at \$9,000 per annum, and."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 6: Page 10, line 22, after the word "amended", insert the following: "Provided further, That in the preparation and distribution of duplicated and photographic material for the Department, the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Office of Information,' current at the time such services are rendered or when payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from the applicable appropriations, to cover charges for personal services, materials, equipment (including depreciation, maintenance, and repair) and other necessary expenses."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment; and in explanation of that motion I may say that the House conferees unanimously approve the language of the amendment, but the situation is such in a parliamentary way that it could not be included in the conference report. It relates to a matter of book-keeping, and will, in the judgment of the conferees, result in some economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: Page 16, line 1, after the parenthesis and comma, strike out "\$2,263,708" and insert "\$2,463,708."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, amendments Nos. 9 and 10 relate to the same subject matter, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report amendment No. 10.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, after the figures in line 2, insert the following: "Provided, That of this amount \$63,708 allotted in the fiscal year 1942 to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population shall be apportioned in the fiscal year 1943 in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from such sum in the fiscal year 1942."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, these amendments and other amendments to be considered later on, relating to the Extension Service, involve a question which has been debated on this floor in connection with the last several agricultural appropriation bills. That is, as to whether or not when a provision has been made by statute law for the distribution of certain types of funds, such as those distributed under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act, for cooperative agricultural extension work, and so forth, and the provision of law is that funds shall be distributed upon the basis of farm population, whether States, which, according to the census figures have either lost in farm population or have not had an increase in farm population comparable to the increase in population

of other States, and on that account would receive less in funds on account of the method of distribution provided by law than they have received heretofore, should have these deficits made up by extra appropriations not authorized by law. This subcommittee has always taken the position that it was not proper for the Congress to make extralegal appropriations, but every year, after the matter has been thoroughly threshed over in debate in the House, the House has finally agreed to the Senate action in providing additional funds; so, under these circumstances, it has been felt by the conferees that the House has well indicated what it thinks ought to be done on this particular issue, and while the motion I have made is not in accordance with the views of the conferees, we feel that it is in accordance with the views of the House, as those views have been frequently expressed heretofore by legislative action, and that further pursuance of their efforts would be fruitless. It is for that reason that the House conferees have instructed me to move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think \$63,708 is a frivolous item?

Mr. TARVER. I certainly do not think the gentleman should credit me with any statement as to its being a frivolous item. I made no such statement.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman said not to concur with the Senate amendment would be frivolous at this time.

Mr. TARVER. I have not used the word "frivolous" in the discussion this morning.

Mr. RICH. Then I misunderstood the gentleman. I understood the gentleman to say that if we did not agree to the Senate amendment, since the House conferees have agreed to it, it would be frivolous on the part of the House. If any item that provides for \$63,708 is frivolous, I want to know it.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman should not put words in my mouth and then proceed to attack the language which he says I used, but which I did not use.

Mr. RICH. I am not charging the gentleman with being frivolous in his statement, but I do say that an item involving that much money is a considerable sum of money. Now, it seems to me that if we agree to this amendment that we are going to give to certain people the same amount of money they got last year, just because we want to do something for some farmers. We do it again just because we did it last year, whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry the gentleman did not understand me clearly. That was undoubtedly due to my inability to express myself clearly.

Mr. RICH. Nobody can express himself better than the Judge, I will say that.

Mr. TARVER. I did not say that the amendment was frivolous. I said that the House conferees had maintained the attitude for several years that this particular item of appropriation should not

be made since it was not authorized by law, and that the question should be addressed to the legislative committee having jurisdiction, if the law were to be changed; but that since we had debated the matter in connection with several appropriation bills heretofore, and the House had always agreed to this provision, therefore we thought it would be fruitless—not frivolous—for the House conferees to undertake to insist on the position which they had maintained heretofore, and for that reason the House conferees had unanimously requested that I, as chairman, should move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Do you not believe in your own heart that this amendment should not be adopted?

Mr. TARVER. I believe, as I said awhile ago, that it is a matter which should be addressed to the discretion of the legislative committee and not dealt with on an appropriation bill, but I also believe that a large majority of the membership of the House disagree with me.

Mr. RICH. Well, let us find out whether they do. I think the House will sustain you. If you come in here with a little fight on this we will just knock this \$63,000 out of this bill.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, we have had a fight on this year after year, and we have never been sustained. The House has always disagreed with us. We are servants of the House. It is our business, insofar as we can, to carry out the will of the House. If anything has been conclusively demonstrated in this House, it is that the House desires this particular item carried in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman know that the House is in a different temper today? That we are here to economize? Now, let us put the fellows to a test and see if they will not sustain you. Let us disagree to this amendment and take it back.

Mr. TARVER. As I said awhile ago, I think that would be a fruitless proposition. I am almost moved to say it would be frivolous.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. What is necessary for us to do in order to get the House vote on this?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has moved the previous question and the Chair must put that question. If the House votes down the previous question, other motions may be made.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: Page 16, line 9, strike out "\$6,726,208" and insert "\$6,926,208."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, which is merely a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 17, line 24, strike out "\$6,982,705" and insert "\$7,182,705."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This is merely a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 14 and 15 may be considered together, as they involve the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: Page 19, beginning in line 3, strike out down through line 3, on page 20.

Amendment No. 15: Page 20, after line 3, insert "Additional cooperative extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$555,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 14 and 15.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same subject matter that was discussed a few moments ago, in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was interested. The other items related to the apportionment of funds under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. This item relates to the apportionment of funds for cooperative extension work. The question involved is exactly the same. The House conferees are unanimously of opinion that the House should be asked to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: Page 21, line 9, strike out "\$13,806,950" and insert "\$14,186,950."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,158,950."

Mr. TARVER. This is merely the correction of a total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 22, line 3, strike out "\$14,453,408" and insert "\$14,833,408."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$14,805,408."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, again, this is merely the correction of a total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: Page 22, line 20, strike out "\$278,798" and insert "\$778,798."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 21: Page 24, line 15, strike out "\$25,612,730" and insert "\$26,902,730."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 31: Page 34, line 19, strike out "\$575,475" and insert in lieu thereof "\$572,580."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment No. 31 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$579,895."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 36: Page 38, line 17, strike out "\$5,130,277" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,177,382."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,192,197."

Mr. TARVER. This is merely the correction of a total, Mr. Speaker.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38: Page 43, line 23, strike out "\$11,266,446" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,286,446."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEAVY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,266,446."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the House conferees, to offer a motion that would seem to be in conflict with the position of the majority of my fellow conferees, at first blush might appear to put me in an inconsistent position; but we have disagreements in these matters, and we did have some substantial disagreement upon this item.

There are a number of items in this conference report which I feel are of tremendous consequence. I feel that the Senate probably was in a position to give more mature consideration to the changed conditions that came from the time we passed the bill in the House until the time it was considered in the Senate. There are three items here dealing with forests. There is this amendment, No. 38, and amendments 42 and 45.

The particular amendment that is now under discussion is one wherein I think it would be the part of sound judgment and in the interests of public welfare that the House accept the Senate position with one exception. Amendment 38 is properly divided into two parts, and I want to make an explanation so that no one can say we are voting for two different activities. One part of it is \$3,000,000 for forest-fire protection and prevention. The other is a \$20,000 item for recreational facilities in a national forest down in Nevada. I have offered my preferential motion eliminating the \$20,000 item because it has no very direct relevancy to the \$3,000,000 item, though it does have merit when considered by itself. But the \$3,000,000 item is one of paramount importance, not alone to those who come from the Western States where the great forests exist but to the Nation as a whole—to the New England States, to the Great Lakes States, to the Southern States, to every part of this great country. Every American and every member of my committee will admit that this year we are confronted with a fire hazard in our forests far beyond anything that we have ever had, even considering the last war period.

Just the other day the House, unwisely I think, took out of the forests the C. C. C. That organization goes out on July 1 if the action of the House stands. Seventeen thousand young men will be taken out of 200,000,000 acres of the public forest land and will no longer be available for fire-protection and fire-prevention work, which they have so magnificently carried forward.

Let me tell you what this \$3,000,000 item does. It supplements an item of \$5,000,000 previously granted and supplements the general appropriations. We have for the national forests a statutory provision that the Congress will appro-

priate, and it does annually, \$100,000 for fire protection, and then if a fire breaks out and it is required by reason of the emergent conditions to spend ten, twenty, or thirty million dollars, it is spent and provided for in a deficiency appropriation; but the \$5,000,000 heretofore appropriated and the \$3,000,000 that we seek to add to that sum is only \$8,000,000 of the \$18,000,000 that the forest people think we need to meet the greatly increased fire hazard.

This money is not money in any way involved with the unlimited expenditure for checking a fire that has once gotten beyond control. This \$3,000,000 is for the sole purpose of preventing fires and when they do break out of controlling them. The Forest Service has demonstrated in its history that it is one of the most remarkably complete and perfect fire-fighting organizations that has ever been developed, but they must be allowed sufficient funds to keep in operation their lookout stations, their smoke-chaser crews, and all these other facilities that go with fire protection.

Let me give you one illustration that ought to convince anyone of the efficiency of this Forest Service as an agency, if you will permit them to function properly by giving them sufficient money. Last year in one forest in my congressional district lightning late in August set 117 fires in one night. By reason of the Forest Service efficiency, aided by the C. C. C., every fire was extinguished before it had burned over 10 acres of ground. In 1933 when we were lax in forest fire protection, a fire broke out in western Oregon that swept over the crest of the Cascade Mountains into eastern Oregon and destroyed \$265,000,000 worth of fine merchantable timber, because we did not have the men and the boys to put out the fire when it started.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I sincerely hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted by the House because in the four States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon we have over 100,000,000 acres of fine timberland. We have in addition to the hazards heretofore mentioned the hazard of sabotage. Bombs may be dropped which are incendiary in nature and it might result in sweeping out that entire Northwestern country. In addition, our manpower today in that western country is depleted because of enlistments, war work, and because they are taken into various industries that are offering larger pay. The result is that we have not the manpower to stop and arrest fires that we had formerly. Then we are denied the C. C. C. help that we had heretofore for putting out those fires. We are in danger—more than ever. I have frequently pointed this out on the floor.

Mr. LEAVY. I agree with everything the gentleman said.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Does this \$3,000,000 provide for the operation of towers, the construction of fire lines, and so forth?

Mr. LEAVY. In national forests. There is another item of two and a half million dollars, an amendment referred to by the gentleman from Illinois as being a sum that there is no authorization for, but it is perfectly legal if Congress sees fit to provide the item. That is the cooperative fire-fighting fund, where the National Government cooperates with State organizations and private agencies.

To show you that this is not merely a local matter that affects the west coast and the west coast alone—and if it were that even it would justify itself a thousandfold—may I refer to headlines that have appeared in the papers during the last 60 days.

Fire menaces 200 homes in New Jersey—"Forest fires hamper U Boat."

RALEIGH, N. C., May 6.—Fly plane in fire area. Smoke from burning forest suggests volcanic eruption.

That is from down in North Carolina.

Martial law decreed as forest fire hits three Rhode Island towns.

That is May 1 of this year.

This is only the first stage of the forest-fire hazards. We have an estate beyond calculation in dollars and cents in our forests—national, State, and private. We have an increased hazard this year, certainly on the west coast, and we have it everywhere, because unfortunately every one of our 130,000,000 American citizens are not as patriotic and as loyal as they should be. Here and there we must grant that in this great population of 130,000,000 there are some who are against the position of the Government in this mighty struggle for survival. No easier method of sabotage and of destruction exists than by setting fires in the national forests and on other forest lands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. What is done with this amendment will perhaps to some extent govern what may be done with the next one, where the private holdings and the State holdings may jointly cooperate, and likewise with the \$1,000,000 amendment that would maintain the roads and trails.

May I say in conclusion that the sum involved is insignificant compared with the sums this Congress is appropriating. The possibilities of damage are tremendous. They would run into the billions of dollars if we had another fire as we had in 1910. The loss of life possible is beyond calculation. The hindering of our war program that is possible is terrible even to consider.

I say without criticism of anyone who disagrees with me that I cannot for the life of me see either the economy, the statesmanship, or the wisdom of denying this insignificant fund. God help us if one of those 1910 or 1933 fires should again get loose and go beyond the control of man, and that danger exists in a high degree.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If this money is appropriated, if the amount is increased as provided in the amendment, will it be necessary the money be spent unless there is a forest fire?

Mr. LEAVY. No; this money is not to be used to fight a fire that has gotten out of control. It is to be used to prevent fires from getting out of control.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe the gentleman understood my question. Will it be necessary to spend this money if we appropriate it?

Mr. LEAVY. No; if we do not need it. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I come to the floor of the House to ask an increase in appropriations. I have a 3,000,000-acre forest area in my district and I know something about forest-fire protection.

You will recall that the other day when we debated the C. C. C. I quoted Mr. Morrell, who has charge of the C. C. C. in the forest areas, under the Department of Agriculture. I asked Mr. Morrell—

Is not it a fact, Mr. Morrell, that if we were to give you one-third to one-half of the money spent by the Civilian Conservation Corps, you could give us as much forest-fire protection?

Or words to that effect.

He replied:

That is true.

I want to see the forests protected. I know their value. I know just what they mean not only in terms of timber but in terms of fish and game and recreational areas.

This appropriation provides for money to hire men to man the fire towers and to build the fire lines. The forest-fire forces operate something like this: The man in the fire tower watches a certain area, and when a fire occurs in that area he refers to the map he has in the tower, from which he can tell exactly where that fire is. He can locate the quarter of a section where the fire is. He calls up the fire warden of that area, who rushes out with a car carrying fire extinguishers, water, and so forth. In 9 cases out of 10 they will put the fire out before it burns over more than a quarter of an acre, and sometimes a space not more than a hundred yards square. That is the kind of service that gives real forest-fire protection.

If you turn this money over to the Forest Service to handle as they see fit, with their own crews, you will get as near value received for every dollar spent as you can get from any agency of the Government. The Forest Service is very efficient if you permit it to operate in its own way.

My candid opinion is that you will get more value out of this \$3,000,000 than you will out of spending two or three times that amount on C. C. C. work. I have

talked to a number of men, State foresters as well as regional and national foresters, and every one has told me, that if we will give them one-third to one-half the money we have been spending on the C. C. C. they will give the same amount of protection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has any estimate been made of what it would cost to put these fire towers and the other fire-prevention machinery in all the forests of this country?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not know of any. There are 170,000,000 acres of forest lands under the Department of Agriculture, as I recall, in addition to park lands under the Department of the Interior. Whether or not it is advisable to put this fire-prevention service all over I do not know. That would be a question for the Forest Service to determine. It certainly should be in the forest areas where there are real forests, young forests which should be protected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This hazard will exist just as long as you have forests.

Mr. ENGEL. As long as you have forests you will have fire hazards, and you should cooperate with the States and the States should cooperate with private owners and the two should cooperate with the national-forest officials.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], and for reasons which I am sure the entire House can readily understand. From this time of year on until November or December the entire area along the coast of California, from above San Francisco Bay to the Mexican border, is literally a tinder box. Our hills, covered with dried grass and low-lying brush, can be set afire most readily from a number of different causes. I believe no precaution could be too great to prevent the kind of catastrophe that could take place if even a few enemy aircraft should get over that area. Fires in those regions spread with tremendous rapidity. They are extremely difficult to combat. There are all kinds of important national defense installations all up and down our coast. We are doing, perhaps, as big a job in that respect as any other section of the country. All we ask is a chance to stop this destruction before it gets started, and that is what this money is for.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that I concur in the remarks he has made and also the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], because when the hearings were had on the C. C. C. before our committee it appeared conclusively that if funds were provided for the Forest Service they would be able to take care of this situa-

tion, and here is an opportunity to provide in some measure, at least, funds that will enable the Forest Service to provide the necessary equipment for preventing fires from getting started.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was on hearing before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in January and February. When it came to us in the form of a Budget estimate there was nothing included for the item of emergency forest-fire control, which is the item presently before us. The parliamentary situation now is this: The House provided nothing, the Budget estimated nothing for it, and the House therefore made no provision for this item. When it went to the Senate the Senate wrote in \$3,000,000, the conferees disagree and bring it back. Our good friend, Judge LEAVY, now offers a preferential motion to recede and concur with an item of \$3,000,000. It is rather singular that while this bill was on hearing before the Senate subcommittee in the month of May, just a month ago, somebody in the Budget or somebody in the administration did not go before Senator RUSSELL's committee with a supplementary estimate and say, "You must put in this \$3,000,000." Pearl Harbor was then behind us. The talk of sabotage was behind us. The matter of whether or not this constituted a tremendous hazard was considered at the time and could have been handled in the form of a supplementary estimate that might have gone before the subcommittee. Such, however, was not the case. Frankly, I certainly would be the last to stand in the way of adequate appropriations for forest-fire control, but it is rather interesting that the whole matter must have been ventilated before the Budget at one time or another, but in all this time up to now there is still no supplemental estimate on the part of the Budget, the President, or any other agency to indicate that this fund is necessary.

My notion is, perhaps, the House ought to further disagree and let this matter go back to conference, at which time we can work it out, I think, in a satisfactory manner and probably take some additional testimony. It may be that certain moneys will be allowed, or maybe the full amount will be allowed; but at least it seems to me it warrants further examination because it does involve \$3,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that from the newspaper accounts that we have seen in the last several months the protection of our forests is one of the vital things before us today. We hear about the fires in North Carolina, and we hear about the fires in the great Northwest, and yet we are cutting down this needed appropriation to assist in that vital protection. It seems to me that it is unwise not to appropriate the money necessary for this vital need. I

am in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Washington to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the Leavy motion to recede and concur, because I think we ought to preserve the forests of this country. It is true, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said, that nothing was suggested by the Budget Bureau in respect to this, nor was anything said by the other committees about this protection of the forest. However, since I have been here I do not remember that any of these agencies have ever before been wiped out, and I do not suppose anybody anticipated that the C. C. C. would be wiped out. However, it has been. Fire protection was one of the chief duties of the C. C. C., and as long as that protection has been wiped out through the wiping out of the C. C. C., then I think this \$3,000,000 should be granted at this time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. But the C. C. C. wiping out has not yet passed the Senate.

Mr. JOHNS. But the chances are that it will, and we will know some more about that when it happens. This \$3,000,000 is essential to protect the forests that we have remaining, because at the present time there is a scarcity of metals in this country, and we are going to use more timber in nearly everything. Also, we need to be prepared for another war in the next 25 years, because we have always had one in about that length of time and probably always will, and we have to prepare for it now, and we ought to do what we can to preserve the remaining forests we have in this country. I hope that the motion will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for a question of fact. I ask my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] whether he does not think the reason the Budget did not say anything about this \$3,000,000 is that it believed that the C. C. C. camps, which have done much of this work, would be passed by the House without being wiped out. Is that a reasonable assumption?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I feel sure it could not have contemplated that the C. C. C. would be abolished, because that was a matter that was entirely in the power of the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I grant that; but I still think the subject was under consideration by the Bureau of the Budget, and I think that very largely answers the position the gentleman has taken. Mr. Speaker, we on the west coast, who are the front line of the Pacific combat area, feel that we are in jeopardy because our country has been specifically described as a combat area, and a large amount of combat divisions of the Army and the Navy are now centered on the protection of the Pacific coast. We feel this

\$3,000,000 is going to be a highly important factor, particularly if San Francisco and Los Angeles were to be attacked. To evacuate the people from those two communities would be very difficult, if not impossible, if forest fires were started prior to the attack. It would be almost impossible to get them out. The \$3,000,000 in controversy, for the protection it could give the Pacific States alone, let alone the other States, in my opinion, would be money well expended, and I ask sincere and favorable consideration of this proposal made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the suggestion made by Judge LEAVY. I recall a few years ago, when I was in the Superior National Forest, one morning with my family we started out and our guide remarked that there was a little fire over on the left of the lake. We moved over there in our boat, thinking that we could put it out in a few minutes. We worked several hours. The fire would have spread over a vast acreage but for the fact that from the tower, which was several miles away, it was sighted, and men were notified of the situation and it was taken care of. Big fires start from little fires. It is economy to stop them in time.

It has been suggested that the C. C. C. would have taken care of this situation, but they are at least temporarily out. I recall in a great fire in the Superior National Forest I saw those boys work. They did a wonderful job. A former Member of this House who sat on the Republican side, who had been in the Forestry Service and who after his retirement went back into the Forestry Service, said to me, "NELSON, one boy trained in the C. C. C. service is worth a half a dozen boys that we can hire out of Duluth or elsewhere to fight these fires."

But the C. C. C. is out. We must make further provision for forest protection. This proposition represents good insurance. I hope it prevails.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the \$3,000,000 additional appropriation asked here would be a mere drop in the bucket in comparison with what the Nation might suffer as a result of one fire in a vital forest area.

Some of that timberland is worth hundreds of dollars per acre as it stands. When you get into an area where they lose 1,000 or 1,500 acres of timber all in one fire, you can readily see that the small amount asked in addition to what is already in the bill is a mere pittance in comparison with the hazard to the timber that is endangered.

Then, too, timber is becoming more of a strategic war material every day. Let us protect it.

I hope the House in its wisdom will not refuse to vote this additional \$3,000,000, because it is desperately needed. If you

defeat this, you are simply saving a few pennies comparatively and risking the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The motion of Mr. LEAVY should and I hope it will prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gist of this whole thing is that this \$3,000,000 would not be asked for except for the extra hazard from sabotage and invasion. The point is if we are in any actual danger of sabotage from the Japanese \$3,000,000 would only be a pittance for security. Ten times that amount probably would not be adequate. If this \$3,000,000 is to guard against sabotage it is no guard at all. If that is the only excuse for it, if we are going to do this thing adequately, that amount is not sufficient. If you put a C. C. C. camp on every hilltop in the West we would not have adequate protection. It is the only excuse for it. This \$3,000,000 is not worth considering because of that argument.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. Every time we add a million or two or three million to each of these appropriation bills it increases our deficit. I have asked the Democrats from time to time where they are going to get the money, and they cannot tell me. Do you know anybody on the Republican side who can tell us where we are going to get the money?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; I cannot.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the most valuable asset in Government ownership in the way of natural resources is the great forest stands in the Northwest.

I happen to represent a district which contains the most valuable timber that the Government owns, great stands of white pine in the State of Idaho. I have lived with those forests all my life. The gentleman speaks of \$3,000,000. To protect those forests we have created in the Forestry Service a great organization. It is conducted along scientific lines. They are handling this business in a scientific way. They have lookouts on the tops of the mountains. They have experienced men. They have their smoke chasers, patrolmen. They have their central organization. They have great supply depots. When a forest fire breaks out they must be vigilant to protect the forests. They may charter a whole string of busses. They may go into the reservoirs of labor and take firefighters from the cities like Spokane or Portland, and load them in these busses and take them across the State to fight these fires.

I have seen one fire in the State of Idaho that consumed more than \$3,000,000 worth of timber. So when you are talking about saving, this is not any saving to cut out this little appropriation. The Forestry Service is protecting you and your interests and the things that

you own, those beautiful stands of timber that you must depend upon for everything that goes into industry in the way of timber.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If you call \$3,000,000 a little appropriation, what do you call a big appropriation?

Mr. WHITE. Let me tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he is talking about \$3,000,000, that the Forestry Service is conserving this timber and selling it and getting the money back.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should try to get clearly in our minds the facts about this Senate amendment to which your House conferees are asking you to continue your disagreement.

I come from an area which includes a part of a great national forest. All of my personal interest is in favor of the protection to the fullest extent possible of our national forests. I certainly would regard it as calamitous for the Congress not to provide sufficient funds for that purpose. But merely to say that we have a great problem, that we have a tremendous national forest acreage which ought to have fire protection, is not to say that we ought to have \$10,000,000 for that purpose for the next fiscal year, for example, or to say that we ought to have any other particularly stated sum.

We have administrative agencies whose duties require that they evaluate the necessities for adequate fire protection for our forests. What have they done? They came in not without any Budget estimate, as has been stated, but with a Budget estimate for \$2,265,693 for this purpose for the next fiscal year, which is the identical amount that was appropriated for this purpose for the present fiscal year.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield at this point. I will yield to the gentleman later.

In this item as it passed the House, \$11,266,446, there are \$2,265,693 for forest-fire protection in our national forests. After that estimate was submitted the Budget submitted an additional estimate of \$2,000,000 for use during the remainder of the present fiscal year and to be carried over into the next fiscal year insofar as it might be unexpended, and this House approved the additional Budget estimate in a deficiency bill. The bill went to the Senate, where, I believe, some \$18,000,000 was added instead of the \$2,000,000 for which a Budget estimate had been had and which the House provided, and in conference between the House and the Senate the figure was placed at \$5,000,000, thereby adding to this \$2,265,000 plus, \$5,000,000 for the purpose of fire protection, giving a total of more than \$7,265,000 plus, or more than three times as much as had been had for the present fiscal year. In connection with the conference report on that bill the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Defi-

ciency Subcommittee and a member of this subcommittee, stated to the House when the House approved this conference report which fixed the amount of these additional funds at \$5,000,000 that the conferees had regarded, from the evidence they had, the sum provided as amply sufficient, but that Congress would be continuously in session for the remainder of the year, and if any need developed for the appropriation of additional funds, that provision could be promptly made.

The Senate amendment proposed to add \$3,000,000 for the purposes which have already been provided for in the regular bill as it passed the House and in the supplemental appropriation of \$5,000,000, bringing the total to \$10,265,000 or some approximate amount as against two million, two hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars plus, which we had for the present fiscal year.

It is just a question of whether you want to be extravagant, whether because you have a good objective and because you value our national forests as I do you want to provide four times as much money as you have ever provided heretofore for fire protection in the national forests. Every argument I have heard used here today could be used just as well in support of a \$50,000,000 appropriation as in support of a \$3,000,000 appropriation. The question is only one of how much money is necessary to effectuate the purpose to be carried out.

Members say that the C. C. C. has been abolished. The C. C. C. has not been abolished, and it is my earnest hope that after action is completed by the Congress on the pending labor-Federal security appropriation bill, it will not have been abolished. In my judgment much of the work this money would pay for could be done by C. C. C. camps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. The Department itself, according to the records before the House and Senate committees, did not ask the Budget for any additional money.

Mr. TARVER. That is undoubtedly true. This drive for additional funds did not originate with the Department; it did not originate with the Budget, and it is not justified by any evidence submitted to the committees of the House or Senate which have had charge of the preparation of this bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. It occurs to me to be a very strange situation when the Budget does not seem to appreciate the fact so much money may be needed, nor do we think it necessary that the billions we have appropriated for national defense should be covered into this particular situation. It may be if, as it is suggested, this is so vital to national defense that \$300,000,000 as against the \$50,000,000

limit the gentleman put would not be a sufficient protection against all the threats of sabotage.

Mr. TARVER. I believe I get the gentleman's point. Whatever money is necessary ought to be provided; whatever money is necessary Congress will provide, but simply to say that you have 166,000,000 acres of national forest land, that the danger of fire is very great, and that the value of the timber to be protected is enormous is not to justify an appropriation 4 times as much as has ever been found necessary heretofore any more than it would justify providing 10 times as much or 100 times as much. Surely you ought to use some discretion and not go ahead and provide large amounts of funds that are not necessary.

I hope the House will permit its conferees to have further consideration of this matter with the Senate conferees and that the motion will be rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be reread.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Leavy motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEAVY) there were—yeas 58, noes 58.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum and ask for tellers.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, we might as well have a roll call now. Evidently we are going to have it anyway. While the gentleman from Washington has demanded tellers, I object to the vote on the ground no quorum is present, and make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 174, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—172

Allen, La.	Byron	Eberharter
Andersen,	Canfield	Elliot, Mass.
H. Carl	Cartwright	Elliot, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Engel
Anderson,	Chenoweth	Englebright
N. Mex.	Cochran	Fitzgerald
Andresen,	Coffee, Wash.	Fitzpatrick
August H.	Colmer	Flaherty
Angell	Costello	Flannagan
Beam	Courtney	Fogarty
Beckworth	Cravens	Forand
Beiter	Creal	Ford, Thomas F.
Bloom	Curtis	Gearhart
Boehne	Davis, Tenn.	Gehrmann
Boykin	Day	Granger
Bradley, Mich.	Delaney	Grant, Ala.
Bradley, Pa.	Dingell	Gregory
Brooks	Domengeaux	Harris, Ark.
Buck	Downs	Healey
Byrne	Dworshak	Hendricks

Hill, Colo.
Hill, Wash.
Hinshaw
Hook
Hope
Houston
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Jacobsen
Johns
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, W. Va.
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, Ill.
Kennedy,
Kennedy,
Kennedy,
Michael J.
Keogh
Kilwan
Klein
Knutson
Koppelman
Lan
Larrabee
Lea
Leavy
Lesinski
Lewis
McGehee
McGraney
McIntyre
McKeough
Maciejewski
Maciora

NAYS—174

Andrews
Arends
Arnold
Baldwin
Barden
Barnes
Barry
Bates, Mass.
Baumhart
Bender
Bennett
Blackney
Bland
Boggs
Bolton
Bonner
Boren
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Bulwinkle
Burgin
Butler
Camp
Cannon, Mo.
Carlson
Chapman
Chiperfield
Clason
Claypool
Clevenger
Coffee, Nebr.
Cole, N. Y.
Collins
Cooley
Cooper
Cox
Crawford
Crowther
Cunningham
D'Alesandro
Davis, Ohio
Dewey
Dickstein
Dirksen
Disney
Dondero
Doughton
Douglass
Duncan
Edmiston
Elston
Faddis
Fenton
Fish
Folger
Fulmer
Gamble
Gathings

NOT VOTING—84

Allen, Ill.
Bates, Ky.
Bell
Bishop
Buckler, Minn.
Buckley, N. Y.

Burch
Burdick
Cannon, Fla.
Capozzoli
Carter
Casey, Mass.
Celler
Clark
Cluett
Cole, Md.
Copeland
Cresser
Culkin
Cullen
Dies
Ditter
Drewry
Durham
Eaton
Ellis
Fellows
Ford, Leland M.
Ford, Miss.
Gale
Gavagan
Green
Hall
Leonard W.
Harrington
Harris, Va.
Hart
Heffernan
Hobbs
Howell
Jarrett
Jenks, N. H.
Johnson,
Lyndon B.
Kee
Kilburn
Kocialkowski
Kramer
Lynch
Marcantonio
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Myers, Pa.
O'Day
O'Leary
Oliver
Osmers
Paddock
Pfeifer
Joseph L.
Ploeser

So the motion was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Ploeser against.
Mr. Youngdahl for, with Mr. Ditter against.
Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Vreeland against.
Mr. Gale for, with Mr. Cluett against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Tinkham against.
Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. O'Leary for, with Mr. Bishop against.
Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Culkin against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Jarrett against.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania against.
Mrs. O'Day for, with Mr. Osmers against.

General pairs:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Green with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Cresser with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Scanlon with Mrs. Byron.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Sacks.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Kocialkowski.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Wene.

The doors were opened.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 40: Page 46, line 16, strike out "\$14,321,425" and insert "\$17,350,075."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$14,330,075."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, that is simply a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41: Page 46, line 23, strike out "\$879,730" and insert "\$892,337."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 41.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: On page 47, line 18, strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 42.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: On page 47, line 19, strike out "\$68,800" and insert "\$74,830."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 43.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: On page 48, line 3, strike out "\$17,175,635" and insert "\$22,704,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 44 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$17,184,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this is merely a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: On page 48, line 11, strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 45.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 46, 47, and 48 be considered together, as they relate to the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: On page 48, line 14, strike out "a part" and insert "parts."

Senate amendment No. 47: On page 48, line 15, strike out "amount" and insert "amounts."

Senate amendment No. 48: On page 48, line 15, strike out "year 1942" and insert "years 1942 and 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 46, 47, and 48.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: On page 77, line 9, after "payments", insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1942 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1942 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the motion.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Has this provision any connection with the amendment adopted by an overwhelming vote of the House, limiting the soil conservation payments to \$1,000?

Mr. TARVER. No; indeed. This has no relationship whatever to that amendment. This relates to an entirely different subject matter. This is a provision which has been carried in the bill heretofore, which would permit the payment of soil-conservation benefits to men who farm as tenants on Government-owned lands. There are a great many tenants within forest areas owned by the Government, and some on lands owned by the Soil Conservation Service, who carry on their own farming operations. Without this provision in the bill they could not secure pay for carrying on soil-conserving practices which redound to the bene-

fit of the Government and improve Government-owned lands, although other farmers located on privately owned lands can receive that type of payment.

As I have said, this is simply a provision that gives simple justice to these men. It has been carried in the bill in prior years, and would have been inserted in the bill by the subcommittee in connection with reporting the bill to the House except that it is legislative in character and, therefore, under the House rules we could not include this provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for the explanation.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire some time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the gentleman yield me some time when I offer my amendment, after the motion to recede is agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. I have nothing further to say at this time, and shall be pleased to yield the gentleman some time if he wishes to address the House now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then I will explain the situation right now.

Mr. Speaker, the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia was a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. I asked for a division of the question for the purpose of offering an amendment when we reach that stage. I propose to offer this amendment at line 13 on page 77. The language of that proviso, beginning on line 10, reads:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1942 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government who comply—

And so forth—

shall be entitled—

And so forth. My amendment would insert after "by the United States Government" the words "or by any State," so as to make it possible for those who rent from States to qualify the same as those who rent from the United States Government.

This amendment is designed to take care of the situation that is created by the scrapping of amendment No. 78, the latter part of which took care of share-renters on lands owned by States such as Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and other States that own and rent lands. Unless such an amendment should be adopted we would have a discriminatory situation where one man renting from the United States Government would be entitled to qualify for payment while his neighbor across the road, renting from a State as landlord, would not be.

Mr. TARVER. I wish to say to the gentleman that I think his position is eminently fair, that if under this proviso in connection with existing law the tenants of State-owned land could not obtain these soil-conservation payments for carrying out soil-conservation practices they are entitled to them, and if his amendment is necessary in that connection I think it ought to be adopted. I confess the question has never been called to the attention of our subcommittee and I have made no study with reference to it to determine whether these tenants are entitled under existing

law to secure these benefits or not; at any rate I do not think they ought to be done an injustice, and so far as I am concerned I am willing to agree to the gentleman's amendment so that when we take up the matter in conference we can determine whether its final adoption would be wise or necessary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's position and his fine sense of justice. This situation arises from the fact that noncompliance by one share renter from a multiple landlord throws the other share renters out of compliance. A landlord renting on shares is held to be an operator and if he is out of compliance on one farm he is out of compliance on all of them. The landlord may not care but it is hard on his tenants if they cannot pay cash rent and become the sole operator. I believe the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is rising, is familiar with the situation.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I understand the situation in South Dakota and in some adjoining States, the \$10,000 limitation upon payments discourages and in some cases prevents the States from going into the program, which also prevents the tenants from participating in the program. If this amendment were adopted the \$10,000 limitation could still apply as far as the States were concerned, and the States as landlords could go into the program or stay out as they choose, but their tenants could go in and would be entitled to receive their payments notwithstanding the fact that the States might choose not to come in.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is correct. Many States have become large landlords. My State has owned 7,000 farms which it rents to farmers. The amendment as offered does not change the \$10,000 limitation on payments to any one operator. It will not help the State treasury or the State as a landlord, but it will give the tenants on State-owned land the same opportunity to participate as tenants on lands owned by the United States Government as is provided by the Senate language.

Mr. TARVER. I am sure no member of the conference on the House has any objection to the gentleman's amendment and I hope we may have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, having waited patiently for an opportunity early in the debate, and speaking generally with respect to the report, I take this belated opportunity to say with respect to it, in the first place, your Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture spent some 90 to 110 days listening to everybody who wanted to talk to it. Then we passed the bill. It went to the Senate. It came back with over a hundred amendments. We went into conference.

Of course, if I could have had my way, probably I would have increased certain appropriations a little, and you may be sure I would have very decidedly decreased others. But I could not have my way.

For example, if I could have put the Monroney amendments into full, practical force and effect, I would have been inclined so to do. There is no sense or rhyme or reason in the representatives of 15 departments all traveling to the same place and undertaking to do what I should be able and ought to do. However, I could not see the practical way to accomplish what MONRONEY was endeavoring to do, and what I would like to do, without doing serious damage to some things I favored and thought ought to be done. So I compromised.

The report pretty well speaks for itself. Insofar as it does not, I am sure that there are those who are perfectly competent to do it who will make their positions very clear.

I admit I assented to some proposals and suggestions of compromise almost against my own better judgment, except for the fact that I would always rather have half a loaf than none at all.

The results of the impact of the opposing forces are evidenced in the conference committee report we have brought out. I have no alibi. I did all that I could do from the standpoint of the minority to sustain the position of the House in regard to the really important and money-spending items. Insofar as I could do it, I made the best trades I could in negotiation, if and when a trade was involved.

If the Department of Agriculture needs more money to provide for the necessities of the Department and of the people, in order to promote the winning of the war, more than we need it otherwise to defend ourselves, and if the Department is able to convince us that this is so, then I will go along with them on a deficiency bill. Otherwise not.

I am going to support the report and defend the position of the House. Such action really should not be called defense, for taken all in all it is, as I see it, the common-sense attitude with regard to the situation as it confronts us.

Not to suspend, without damage to anyone, the farm-tenancy program for the duration is an indefensible expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

The House proposal for Farm Security loans and the program is protective, sufficient, and an adequate sum has been provided.

As to the sales of Government-owned or controlled agricultural commodities, the position of the House is and will be justified for that we must have parity for all or none. And there are other reasons which appeal to those who think and are not pressed to vote by selfish minority groups under threat of reprisal.

Despite all alleged gratuities and subsidies, the farmer is the first man who suffers from the effect of extravagant spending of his hard-earned dollars extracted from him as taxes. He is for justice to all and economy in all things. So am I.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to

concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota moves to concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment: On page 77, between lines 12 and 13, after the phrase "by the United States Government", insert "or by any State."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 81: On page 79, after the figures at the end of line 14, insert "and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 83, 85, and 86, which relate to the same subject matter, be considered together. These are the amendments relating to the limitations proposed on the administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 83: Page 81, line 13, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or";

Amendment No. 85: Page 81, line 18, after the word "agriculture", insert "": *Provided further*, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes."

Amendment No. 86: Page 81, line 20, after the period insert "": *Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments 83, 85, and 86.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following preferential motion which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN moves to recede and concur in amendments Nos. 83, 85, and 86.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. When the agricultural appropriation bill passed the House it was with this proviso which prohibited the use of any of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of selling Government-owned or controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price, as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The Senate made five amendments to this proviso. One of them is a mere technical change of language, and has been agreed to in the conference report. One of them, No. 84, involves the striking out of the word "alcohol" in the House language permitting the sale of deteriorated grain for purposes of feeding or of manufacturing alcohol, and the insertion of the words "ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber." The House has already agreed to amendment No. 84 in the conference report. The question

involved here is whether or not the House will agree to this amendment, which would permit the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, not deteriorated wheat, for feeding purposes at a price which shall not be less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made.

The amendment proposed by the Senate—and to which, I believe, the unanimous feeling of the conferees on the part of the House is that the House should refuse to agree—is, in my judgment an amendment which would absolutely destroy the parity principle. It is not an amendment in which either I or the district from which I come have any direct interest, except that my district might be more interested from the standpoint of the consumer in a lower price for wheat than it would be in a higher price for wheat because, while some wheat is raised in my district, it is not a producer of wheat for commerce, and the larger portion of my constituents are consumers of wheat and of wheat products, and, therefore, it might be thought that from a selfish interest alone I would favor the House agreeing to the Senate amendment, which is an amendment undoubtedly calculated to bear the price of wheat, but I shall adopt no such selfish view. I think those of us in this House who represent farm constituencies must stand together; if we are ever going to be able to carry out any beneficial program in the interest of agriculture. The just rights of the wheat and corn farmer are of interest to the cotton farmer and ought to be of interest to every fair-minded citizen. Nothing has been done by the Senate to this proviso which in any way affects the interest of cotton unless cotton is affected by the decline in the price of other agricultural commodities, which I conceive to be true, but whenever the Representatives from cotton areas in this House undertake to take the position that because legislation is not of a character which directly affects cotton or cotton producers, and fail to stand by their colleagues in the wheat and corn- and tobacco- and rice-producing areas of the country, when their interests become vitally involved and when their position is right, simply because cotton is not directly concerned, we are going to cease as Representatives of agricultural areas to be a force in this House which is capable of accomplishing anything, either in behalf of the cotton grower, the corn grower, the wheat grower, or in behalf of any other segment of agriculture. Every Member of the House should be interested in maintaining the just rights of all citizens on all occasions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does my distinguished friend want to leave the record that he is appealing to the House on this occasion to support his position on the basis that those who represent farming districts must stand together? I am sure the gentleman, knowing him as I do, does not want the record to stand that he is appealing to the Representatives of farmers to stand together when

we are here as Representatives of the United States.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman will understand me clearly before I conclude.

May I say to the gentleman that unless the Representatives of the agricultural areas of the country do stand together in support of simple justice—not in support of any grab from the Treasury of the United States; not in support of any extravagance for the benefit of agriculture, but unless they do stand together in support of those things which are fair to agriculture, it is my conception that those things will never be achieved.

We talk about trying to keep down the cost of living. That is the object of these amendments. The object of these amendments is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to manipulate the farm markets so as to depress the prices of agricultural commodities. I do not make that statement inadvisedly, because if you will examine pages 40 and the following pages of part 1 of the hearings held in the House on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill you will find that the Secretary of Agriculture frankly avowed that to be his program, and in the course of his evidence at that time he did not spring this business about selling a quantity of wheat for feeding purposes. That was an afterthought. All that he had in mind then was being allowed, when he thought the price of wheat was too high or the price of corn was too high, even though it had not reached parity, to feed quantities of these Government-owned stocks of wheat and corn into the market, for what purpose? Not for stock-feeding purposes but to depress the price and prevent an increase in the cost of food products manufactured from wheat and corn to the consuming public of this country.

Now, for years we have professed the purpose to try to bring about in some way parity prices for agricultural commodities. We have been led to believe that because of current conditions in the United States the time might be approaching when farmers' prices, if they are not interfered with in some way such as this, may approach and in some cases exceed parity. When we are about to come onto the threshold of our hopes and dreams during this long period of years we are met by the proposition that the markets are to be manipulated by the Government or agencies of the Government, so as to prevent the achieving of that goal, parity, which we have so long sought. And that that is to be done in the interest of holding down the cost of living to the consuming public of this country, most of whom are on a far better basis with reference to parity conditions in their incomes than the farmer is with reference to parity conditions in his income.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. RAMSPECK]. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

These Representatives from the industrial areas of the country in the main

have been standing by in this fight to obtain simple justice for our agricultural population. They have not voted against parity for the farmer. That is, most of them have not, even though somebody in their districts might raise the specious claim that if a few cents more were obtained by the farmer for a bushel of wheat it would increase the cost of bread. As a matter of fact, the cost of bread to their constituents is usually about 10 cents a loaf, whether wheat is selling for 50 cents a bushel or for \$1.50 a bushel. There is very little connection between the price of the raw product, wheat, as it leaves the farm and goes to the market, and the cost of the finished product, bread, as it enters the home of the average consumer. But the industrial worker of this country wants the farmer to obtain a fair price for his product. If the average industrial worker of the country, according to statistics which have been submitted to our committee, were comparing his condition with the 1909-14 level he would be getting over 300 percent of what he got in the period from 1909 to 1914, and here is the farmer still struggling trying to get 100 percent of what he got back there. Under those circumstances, no one can convince me that the fair-minded industrial worker wants to hold the farmer's price down below even 100 percent of parity, simply in the hope that some dealer in foodstuffs may slightly reduce the price of his bread below what it would otherwise be, which would probably be a forlorn hope.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. As the gentleman knows, I represent both agricultural sections and industrial sections. The thing that bothers me is this tremendous surplus of wheat on hand. I am told there are 200,000,000 bushels of the 1940 crop stored away; about 400,000,000 bushels of the 1941 crop, and there is an estimated crop of 800,000,000 bushels for 1942. In my district they cannot even find available space to store the wheat. I do not see why we could not permit those farmers to use this wheat as feed.

Mr. TARVER. This proposal, if the gentleman understands the Senate amendments correctly, is not to let the farmers use their wheat as feed, but to let the Government of the United States use wheat that belongs to it, the Government, which has professedly been trying to bring about parity conditions in agriculture, to depress the price of wheat. I do not think that the adoption of these amendments would result in a considerable increase in the consumption of wheat. I think the country is going to consume about the same amount of wheat whether the Congress insists on a continuance of the conditions that will bring about parity prices or not.

This is simply a provision which is intended to depress below parity levels the price of wheat and corn. I cannot see how its adoption would in any way tend to get rid of the wheat surplus to which the gentleman has referred. Let me make this further observation, nobody knows at this time when the war condi-

tions which now obtain are going to be ended. There are some of us at least who hope there may be a chance they will be ended within the next year. Whenever they shall be ended there will be hundreds of millions of people in this old world of ours who are now in destitute circumstances and who will then be starving, who will want your tremendous surplus of wheat, and the humanitarian spirit of this country is going to insist that those people shall not be allowed to starve; so I am unable to agree that in the present state of the world you are able to say that you have too much wheat or that you will have too much wheat. After the present crop is harvested it may well be that despite this huge surplus to which you refer you still will not have the wheat necessary to relieve the human suffering which will exist among so many hundreds of millions of people after this war is over. I am unable to believe that at that time it is going to be a calamity to have too much bread.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why should they insist upon reducing the price of grain for industrial alcohol when we all know that the producers of this industrial alcohol are making the most unconscionable profits of any manufacturer in the war effort?

Mr. TARVER. I quite agree with the gentlewoman and shall be pleased to yield her a couple of minutes in which she may expand her idea.

I certainly hope the House will send these matters back to conference in order that if possible agreement may be reached with the Senate. I sincerely hope that the Congress of the United States will never consent to the destruction by the Government itself of the parity principle.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In the event this bill goes back to conference will it be possible for the conferees to work out a proviso whereby domestic wheat could be supplied to our domestic millers at a competitive price with Canadian wheat to permit those millers to export that flour? Under present conditions they can buy Canadian wheat in bond and export that wheat without paying duty; as a result they purchase wheat from Canadian sources rather than domestic sources.

Mr. TARVER. All matters which are within the differences represented by the language of the House bill and the language of the bill as it passed the Senate would be within the scope of the conference. As to just what language different from that which now appears in the bill might be worked out I, of course, am not in position to say. I may say, however, there exists a very well-defined notion on the part of some of us that this anxiety to receive huge quantities of Government-owned wheat for feed pur-

poses may be a desire on the part of the millers of feedstuffs to procure cheaper supplies for the manufacture of their products and that if they should succeed in doing that, their having done so would not necessarily be reflected in any lower price to the consumers of their products.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I do not like either provision.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my amendment is to provide cheaper feed for the farmer's livestock from this huge surplus. The Department of Agriculture is in favor of the amendment; the administration is in favor of the amendment. Who is going to get the benefit? The farmer. It is the farmer who is going to get cheaper food for his livestock. Farmers will be encouraged by this cheaper feed to raise what is needed.

Further, the operation will stabilize the price of meat, and so forth, to the consumer, but do not forget that at the same time we are going to pay the farmer fair, or parity, prices for what he puts on the market. It cannot be denied that the House amendment requires the farmer to pay a higher price for feed. If it does not, let somebody correct me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As a matter of fact, the farmers who buy this wheat as feed do not get it at any lower price, because the wheat is sold to the processor and he sells it out at the regular old price to the farmer.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why does not the farmer buy it himself?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The farmer does not buy it from the Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. He should, and it is the intent of the amendment that the farmer get cheaper feed. I want the farmer to get the benefit. The trouble with the farmer is that he does not get a fair share of the price the consumer pays; it is the middleman who gets the money. That has always been the trouble, but Congress has never by legislation sought to cure it.

If the farmers are going to be foolish enough, when the Government sells this wheat below parity, to let somebody buy it and resell it to them at a higher price, then they do not deserve any sympathy. We do not want them to do that.

Give the farmers this opportunity and, in my opinion, they will extend themselves. They are patriotic, they want to do everything they can to help win this war, and they are doing it. If we cannot feed our soldiers they cannot fight. We need this food. We need it for those in the armed forces.

The administration is appealing for this legislation and have been appealing for it all the time. As the gentleman

from Pennsylvania asked, and I have had letters to the same effect, where are you going to store this year's crop of wheat if you do not get rid of some of the surplus?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman says the administration is appealing for this amendment. Can the gentleman point out where the administration has made any such demand that the farmers produce food at less than cost? When he produces wheat at 85 percent of the parity price of corn, as provided in the pending amendment, he is producing it at less than 71 cents per bushel, and that is less than the cost of production.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is not taking it away from the farmers. This has nothing to do with production. It solely refers to sale of the surplus which belongs to the Government.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Where has the administration ever made any such request? The administration has never asked that the farmer be compelled to sell \$1.13 wheat for 71 cents? The administration is always willing for the farmer to have a fair price. The administration endorses farm parity, and that is \$1.13 for wheat and 84 cents for corn.

Mr. COCHRAN. We want to give the farmer a fair price. I have voted for that ever since I have been here and will continue to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman does not answer the question. He says the administration is for the amendment. Will he point out where the administration has announced that it is for the amendment?

Mr. COCHRAN. That question is not involved here at all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman raised the question. He urged the passage of his amendment, because he says the administration is for it. Will he point out where the administration has asked for it?

Mr. COCHRAN. I read a letter from the Department of Agriculture submitting an argument in favor of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman does not quote the letter or give its author. And who in the Department of Agriculture is authorized to commit the administration to so astounding a reversal of policy?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that the administration is in favor of the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to have the gentleman submit documentary substantiation of such an epoch-making commitment. This administration is for a fair deal for the farmer.

Mr. COCHRAN. Please speak in your own time. You can get it. You are a member of the committee. I have only 5 minutes.

We are going to put our hands into the Treasury of the United States and show a loss upon the surplus wheat that we have in storage by letting the farmers have the feed at a lower price than the Government paid for it. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is just as stanch a friend of the farmer as there is in this House and he agrees with what I say. I am willing to go along with the gentleman from Oregon. He is a wheat farmer and he represents nothing but farmers. When the Government wants to give something to the farmers, how can those who represent the farmers stand up and say, "No; we are not going to let the Government do anything for the farmers"? Why, it is absurd to say that. I am trying to help the farmers by getting them cheap feed, although I come from the city. I have tried ever since I have been here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into a controversy with those who represent the farmers in this great body. I am very sorry to hear the argument advanced and the appeals made in this body that those who represent farming districts must stick together.

I have not a farm in my district. I spoke for the Bankhead cotton bill when it passed this House by six or seven votes. I spoke in favor of the farmer-tenant legislation when it passed this House by a very few votes. I spoke in favor of all legislation in the past 10 years that was beneficial to the farmers of this country and I did that not as one who represents a farming district but as an American, trying to view the farm problem from a national angle. It was the problem of my people just the same as it was the problem of the people of the rural districts. May I state, and I do not say this in any critical sense, that I hope the appeal to blocs and groups will not be made because the reaction to that is to appeal to the city group, and under no conditions will anyone condone that and under no condition would I make such an argument. I like to look at this from a broad angle. Certainly this Government is not trying to destroy parity. The very administration that created parity trying to destroy it? Why, I cannot follow such an argument.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have the utmost respect for the gentleman and I could not refrain from yielding to him.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Why does this bill say that the farmer shall get only 85 percent of parity if the gentleman favors full parity?

Mr. McCORMACK. Because the bill also provides that the farmer in any event shall receive parity. Oh, yes. This grain may be sold for 85 percent of parity to the farmer on the poultry farm, the man who produces meat, eggs, and milk, or the dairy farmer. The Government may sell this for 85 percent of parity, but, if I

understand it correctly, the Government pays the farmer the parity price.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. McCORMACK. For a correction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This bill permits the wheat to be sold for 85 percent of the corn parity; in other words, 53 cents under the wheat parity, if the gentleman from Massachusetts would like to know the fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I ask the gentleman to discover the facts and know what he is talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is rather dogmatic, but certainly no one intends that. I am not so strong in my convictions that I would say the gentleman is wrong, but I think he is wrong.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I ask the gentleman to ask other gentlemen here from the committee if I am not right on that point. Read the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The language of the amendment is—

That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made.

Therefore, the amendment would permit the sale of wheat at 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Now, I will accept the gentleman's correction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman from Georgia construe it to be the intent of the administration that that should exist, or is that a mistake in the amendment inserted by the Senate, in all frankness?

Mr. TARVER. I would not undertake to interpret the mind of the administration, but I am quite sure that it is the intent of the authors of the amendment in the Senate that this should be the provision, and the Senate itself, as I understand, rejected a proposal that it should be limited to 85 percent of the parity price of wheat.

Mr. McCORMACK. I merely wish to observe that this motion to recede and concur takes into consideration the interests of the entire country, not only the farmer but the consumer. Certainly it is wrong to prohibit the Government from selling this excess grain and compel it to sell it at 100 percent of parity.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 6, 1942.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. McCORMACK: Enclosed is a statement explaining the issues involved in the difference between the Senate and the House versions of the current agricultural appropriation bill with respect to sales of Government-owned and Government-controlled grain. This statement is being sent in order to facilitate discussion of this matter at the meeting to be held Monday morning, June 8. Copies of this statement have been sent to the President and to Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. FLAVIN,
Assistant to the Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

GOVERNMENT SALE OF GRAIN FOR LIVESTOCK FEED AND ITS RELATION TO THE COST OF LIVING

AN ANALYSIS OF HOUSE AND SENATE PROVISIONS OF THE 1943 AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL RELATING TO SALE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF GRAINS FOR LIVESTOCK FEED

The facts

1. The Nation has abundant feed in the ever-normal granary.
2. The Nation needs to convert this surplus feed into needed meat, milk, eggs, and similar products.
3. To encourage farmers to make the conversion, the Department of Agriculture is selling grain for feed at moderate prices.
4. To be fair to grain producers, payments are made to them to make up the difference between the sale price and parity price. The effect of the whole operation is to stabilize the prices of meat, milk, and eggs to consumers, and at the same time to pay farmers fair (or parity) prices.
5. The 1943 agricultural appropriation bill as it passed the House would jeopardize this program by forcing the Department to sell feed grains to farmers at higher prices. This would either increase the cost of living and increase the danger of inflation, or it would cut down food production. Whichever happened, the war effort would be hampered.
6. The Senate version of the bill would enable farmers to go ahead full speed with the wartime production program, and would help stabilize living costs of consumers.

The situation

The 1943 agricultural appropriation bill, as passed by the House, contains a provision which has the effect of prohibiting the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price.

Senate amendments permit grain to be sold at less than parity, limiting sales of wheat to 125,000,000 bushels for feed.

The present and prospective large Government holdings, which have been built up in ever-normal-granary storage, make the price at which the Government sells these accumulated stocks an important factor in the whole feed-price situation. As of May 30, Commodity Credit stock totaled 63,000,000 bushels of corn and 315,000,000 bushels of wheat. Probably most of the approximately 100,000,000 bushels of wheat still under loan will also be acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation. These stocks are the equivalent of about one-fifth of an average corn crop.

As of May 15, the average farm price of corn was 81 cents a bushel, or 83 percent of parity. As of the same date the average farm price of wheat was \$1 a bushel, or 74 percent of parity. The House proposal would force the Government to raise its prices on corn to around \$1 a bushel and on wheat to around \$1.35 a bushel. Because the Government holds such a large part of the supply, the price of feed grains would go to the parity price of corn.

Effect of the House provisions

Stated in its simplest terms, the effect of the House version would be:

- (a) To increase the cost of living by making food costs go up; or
- (b) To force farmers to cut down on the production of foods needed to help win the war.

How the House provision would force up the cost of living

Forcing the Government to sell at parity would drive up all corn and wheat prices. This would raise the cost of feeding cows, chickens, and hogs. This would increase the cost of the foods most needed for the war. It would mean higher prices for milk, for meat, for eggs, for butter, for lard; in fact, for all livestock, dairy, and poultry products.

How much the cost of living would be affected

If legislation is passed which causes corn prices to advance to parity, the maintenance or further increase of livestock production can be obtained only by a substantial increase in the prices to consumers of milk, meat, and eggs. In order to maintain the present increase in the production of these livestock products with higher feed costs it might be necessary to increase the consumers' annual food bill by a billion dollars.

How the House provision would cut down on production

The most important factor encouraging farmers to maintain and increase livestock production is the relationship between feed prices and livestock prices. This leads to one simple conclusion which sums up the whole present problem. When feed is low in relation to livestock prices, farmers expand livestock production. When feed is high in relation to livestock prices, farmers cut down or go out of livestock production.

To make successful war, we need the largest possible production of meat, milk, and eggs. The prices of hogs and cattle are somewhat above parity and those of eggs and milk, about at parity. Corn is the basic livestock feed grain. With prices of corn at 85 percent of parity, feeding ratios are favorable to expanded production of livestock and livestock products without consumers having to pay exorbitantly high prices for them. Expansion is taking place. For example, the number of pigs raised in 1942 will be the largest on record—nearly 100,000,000 head.

These favorable feeding ratios have been maintained in considerable part because of the policy of the Department of releasing corn and wheat for feeding purposes at about current corn prices, or 85 percent of corn parity. The Senate version of the agricultural appropriation bill would permit the Department to continue this practice. The House version has the effect of prohibiting the sale of corn at less than the corn parity, and of wheat for feed at less than wheat parity. Such prohibition can have only one result; namely, a steady and probably rapid advance in corn prices and corresponding declines in feeding ratios and in livestock production.

The taxpayer would pay several times as much under the House proposal as under the Senate proposal, but the farmer's income would be the same

It is estimated that under the House bill costs to consumers of milk, meat, and eggs might go up as much as \$1,000,000,000. Under the Senate bill the costs to consumers will tend to be held at the present levels. But the incomes of farmers will be the same under either bill. Maintenance of corn prices at the current level, or 85 percent of parity, will not reduce the income to corn growers. Any difference between parity prices for corn and the price at which corn sells on the market will be made up to them through parity payments, for which the pending agricultural appropriation bill carries authorization. Wheat growers are likewise protected.

If the Department is permitted to continue its current practice in the disposal of corn and wheat, the cost to the Treasury of making sure that grain growers receive fair or parity prices would amount to perhaps \$125,000,000 to \$150,000,000. Thus the Senate version of the bill gives farmers the same return as the House version, but the Senate version will cost the public only a fraction as much. Additionally the Senate version retards inflation; the House version promotes inflation.

Higher food costs will threaten labor's position

The House measure has in it the seeds for prolonged controversy over labor. If food prices rise materially, wage earners will inevi-

tably ask for wage increases to match the food costs. This in turn will bring further pressure to restrict labor's earnings, causing disunity at a time when unity is essential.

There is no surplus of the livestock products this legislation would affect

We do not have surpluses of meats, dairy, and poultry products. We need all of these that we can produce.

Wheat may spoil for lack of storage

We do have large supplies of wheat and corn that can be turned into meat, milk, and eggs. As a matter of fact, the United States wheat supply for the coming season promises to be the greatest in our history, nearly a billion and one-half bushels. This is double a normal supply. Our storehouses are already nearly full. Millions of bushels of wheat will be on the ground this fall for lack of storage. The House provisions would aggravate this situation by slowing up the consumption of this wheat for livestock feed.

Our surplus wheat and corn can be used to produce the livestock and dairy and poultry products we need, but to do this prices of feed must not be so high as to discourage farmers from producing.

The wheat and corn we have has been stored in our "ever-normal granary" for use in an emergency. The emergency is here. It is folly now to tie the Nation's hands so that we cannot make the best possible use of our feed reserves in the crisis against which we stored them up.

Dairy farmers especially endangered

Dairy farmers in the big milksheds would suffer especially from the effects of the House provisions. The prices they receive are set under various State and Federal marketing agreements and orders. Changing prices under these agreements is a lengthy process. Under the House version of the bill, the feed prices of dairymen would rise rapidly, but it might be a much longer time before their prices could be adjusted to meet these costs.

If milk prices were maintained at present levels while feed costs went up sharply, many farmers would simply be forced out of production. Both—they and the consumers—would lose in the process.

The present situation is one of reasonable balance. It assures an incentive to full production. It protects farmer's income. It stabilizes prices to consumers. This situation can be maintained under the Senate version of the appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, here before us today we have this question: Are you for parity for the farmer or are you not? This bill calls for the possible sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat at a price not below 85 percent of corn parity. This means that the Government can sell wheat in the neighborhood of 50 cents a bushel under wheat parity. This amendment, unfortunately adopted by the Senate, means that every bushel of that wheat sold for feed gives the speculator in Chicago an opportunity to hold down the price of corn to 85 percent of its true value.

You have all seen the market crumble lately due to this manipulation by the Senate. You have seen the price gradually go down. It is not a question of the farm bloc against any other bloc. I personally have voted for every section of the country and am willing to give them all a square deal. This is simply

the question, Do you want to give the farmer of the Nation the same square deal that everybody else is entitled to?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if the Members of the House know exactly the true market condition of corn today. Out in our district the corn price today is 74 cents, and the parity price of corn is 95 cents.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my district, next to the Dakota line, corn sells for 67 cents and 68 cents a bushel today. We have cold, wet weather. It appears as if we are not even going to make a profit on the farming throughout that large section of the country this year.

Let us refuse to agree to the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and let us say to the farmer of the Nation that at least he is entitled to 100 percent of parity, 100 percent of a square deal, the same thing we want to give to each and every group in America.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. If the powers that be are interested in the consumers, can the gentleman reconcile that interest with the fact that they let the price of pork, for example, be around 125 or 130 percent of parity—despite the fact that there is a law on the books under which Henderson any day he wants to can put on a ceiling of 110 percent of parity—and turn around and ask your neighbors to furnish the corn to feed the hogs at 85 percent of parity?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is unfair.

Here is another point. We in our country pay 30 percent more for farm labor today, yet the price of corn on the farm today is exactly the same as it was last year. Is that fair? Are you through the acceptance of the sale of this 125,000,000 bushels of wheat going to keep corn below 85 percent of parity?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am fully in accord with all that has been said this afternoon upon the principle of maintaining parity prices for farm products. However, I believe that some who have spoken have misconstrued the effect which the adoption of the Senate amendment would have on prices. I think the whole matter has been much exaggerated.

In discussing a problem like this we ought to be practical and realistic. In the present instance we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we will have on hand when this present crop is harvested an estimated total of 1,440,000,000 bushels of wheat in this country, whereas no one can figure out how we are going to consume more than 700,000,000 bushels next year unless we feed a part of it.

The only way we can feed wheat is to get the price down where it is competitive with other feed grains.

So the only chance I see for us to get rid of this tremendous surplus of wheat, or even keep it from piling higher and higher, is for us to adopt the Senate amendment which will permit the sale of at least 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for livestock feed at a price which will be competitive with corn and other feed grains. Then if we can sell a reasonable amount for alcohol, that will further assist in getting rid of this surplus.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am sorry I cannot yield just now.

The statement has been made that this wheat may be needed sometime. This may be true, but we are in a situation now where the storage problem is a most serious one. Practically every bushel of commercial storage in this country is filled. Seventy-five or 80 percent of the wheat crop, the one that is about to be harvested, is going to have to be stored on the farms. Some of it will have to be stored under conditions which will result in deterioration and loss. So there is not much use in our trying to preserve and store this wheat on the theory that we are going to need it in 2 or 3 years to feed hungry people somewhere in the world, because if we store it under those conditions much of it will spoil before that time. We had better take it now, feed it to livestock, produce needed livestock and dairy products and use them for ourselves and our allies in winning the war. After we use all that can be consumed for feed and alcohol there will still be a large carryover if it can be safely stored for feeding hungry people. Furthermore, Canada, Argentina, and Australia have large supplies available for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Very briefly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to support what the gentleman is saying. The farmers in my section of the country are back of this Senate amendment. They want to be able to purchase this wheat for feed purposes.

Mr. HOPE. The farmers in my section are for it and I represent the largest wheat-growing district in the United States. The wheat farmers of this country, I think, are for the Senate amendment for the further reason they realize that unless we can get rid of some of this wheat for feed we are going to have to further reduce wheat acreage and cut the average wheat farmer down to where his acreage permitted for wheat will be so small it will not pay him to produce wheat. That is the situation we are up against.

I realize there are Members here representing corn-growing areas, who take a different view of the situation, but I believe in the long run it is to the interest of all grain producers to get rid of this enormous surplus of wheat because, unless we do, it is going to bog down the market for all grain products.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What is the gentleman's justification for cutting the grain price below parity in order to add to the profits of the industrial alcohol profiteers?

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe that question is involved in this discussion.

I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. What is the relative feeding value for livestock of wheat and corn per bushel?

Mr. HOPE. I think the relative value is about the same, but most feeders are accustomed to feeding corn and, consequently, if you are going to sell wheat for feed, ordinarily, it is necessary to sell it at a little lower price than corn.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why not sell it at equal prices if they are of equal feeding value?

Mr. HOPE. That is what this bill proposes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thought it was 85 percent.

Mr. HOPE. This bill provides that no Government-owned corn or wheat shall be sold for less than 85 percent of price of corn. In other words, both corn and wheat may be sold at 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Following the gentleman's line of reasoning, I suppose if we were to make permissible the selling of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, then it will necessarily follow we will not produce that much corn, and we will have to keep on cutting down on the amount of corn acreage.

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe we are going to have any great surplus of livestock feed in this country if we continue to carry out the food program that is now in effect.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some question raised as to the position of the farm organizations on this subject. As far as I know, only two of these organizations have expressed themselves on this amendment. These two organizations are not in agreement. The Farmers' Union represents a large proportion of the wheat producers of this country. It is for the Senate amendment. I submit herewith as a part of my remarks a wire which I understand has been received by all Members of the House from that great organization:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 8, 1942.

Today's votes on farm appropriation conference report place a great responsibility on you. What the House sows today the Nation will reap next year. House conferees are still recommending greatly reduced Farm Security program. Such economy of dollars is no economy of manpower and land resources of our many underemployed low-income farm families. Farmers in our organizations resent the attempt to dispossess many thousands of these families by cutting off Farm Security Administration aid so that big commercial farm operators may have cheap labor.

We hope you will vote with the President and with the Senate in sustaining an adequate production-loan program through Farm Security Administration. We urge also the adoption of tenant-purchase funds at Senate figure. This program contributes to increased production also. We hope you will vote for the Senate proposal to increase the worthwhile school-lunch program through reappropriations totaling \$45,000,000. This amount will still leave our underfed children far behind British children who are receiving our lend-lease food. Some Congressmen are worried lest granting authority to Commodity Credit to sell grain below full parity establish a precedent. We see no cause for alarm on the part of any section of farmers. Maintenance of farm prices in their present relationships is guaranteed by terms of Senate amendment. However, attempts to force up farm prices can bog down all our livestock feeding plans and do great harm to wheat and small-grain producers. We must move at least the amount of grain provided by Senate if disaster is not to befall wheat producers. Otherwise much grain will not qualify for loans because of lack of any storage space and wheat acreage will perforce be cut next fall. Agriculture's war contribution depends in large part on turning down this conference report. The Nation will not soon forget any selfish efforts to restrict its vital food supply in wartime. The amount of food which will be lost if the House conferees are not voted down would feed an army of approximately 3,000,000 men. We hope you will weigh these issues carefully before voting.

Respectfully,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.
M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of
Grain Cooperatives.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I favor the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], not because the administration is for it, but because it is the right thing to do and that is why I am asking the membership of this House to vote for it.

Eighty-five percent of the corn crop of this Nation is disposed of or fed in the county of its origin. Eighty percent of it is fed on the farms where it originates. The price of corn is going to run to parity. The price of hogs is going to carry it there. There is not going to be any such thing as trouble in getting parity for corn.

This matter of the price of wheat is a tremendously serious one. The wheat farmer has got to get his wheat out of storage. At the present time there is not even any storage where it can be put unless the Commodity Credit Corporation goes to work and gets rid of this grain for feeding purposes for which there is a demand. In view of the tremendous demand for pork, in view of the tremendous demand for cattle, in view of the tremendous demand for dairy products and poultry, we must not have that wheat piled up, a continuing and ever pressing menace to the price of wheat.

Let us get rid of it while the chance is here to get rid of it, and not fool around any longer. It is the right thing to do.

We can turn it into something now where it will be used. Let us turn not only all of the spoiled wheat but 125,000,000 bushels of the other wheat into something that can be used for the war effort. Let us support the war effort instead of imagining something that does not exist. Those people who are disturbed about the price of corn are needlessly disturbed. There can be no substantial sale of corn below the parity price, because the feed demand will put it there. It says that no grain shall be sold for less than 85 percent of the parity price for corn.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. But corn is grain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in Iowa that raises more corn than any other district in the country.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not want to yield. The purpose here is to make a market for wheat and to raise hell with the market for corn. There is no other explanation of it. We had disaster and bankruptcy in the corn-farming areas of our country after World War No. 1 when we had to sell corn for 8 cents a bushel. We burned corn in our homes in order to keep warm, rather than sell it for 8 cents and then buy coal with the money. We burned corn in the courthouse in the county where I live. Foreclosures swept away the homes of our farm people. Since then there have been many attempts to help and many failures, and corn farmers remained in submergence and economic loss and failures. We had the McNary-Haugen proposition, but it was twice vetoed by President Coolidge. Then we tried the Farm Board ideas of the Hoover administration, but this was worse than useless, because its final result was to give \$500,000,000 to grain speculators and nothing to farmers. We then passed the processing tax bill, but this was held to be unconstitutional and void by the Supreme Court in 1936. We now have the A. A. A. program under which we warehouse grain on the farm and under which farmers get parity payments and conservation allowances. Now the present proposal seeks to do away with the parity principle for which we have been fighting all of these years. We have told the farmer that he ought to have parity. Does anyone believe that he ought to be placed below parity or to be on a level less than parity with other people, or that farmers in Iowa should be lower and not on a par with the people of Massachusetts or of Kansas, or that the corn farmer is not entitled to as fair treatment as the wheat farmer? Shall such a disparity be enacted into law by this vote? Shall Congress by law

kick one farmer down and raise the other up by this vote?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not think I will yield to the gentleman. He fully agrees with me, but I cannot yield for lack of time.

The parity principle is the thing that we have taught, that we believe in, that we have prayed for, that has been promised, but this motion simply provides that wheat shall come into the corn areas and be sold for prices away below the corn parity price and thus put corn off of the market. I do not object to the language that was in the bill as it passed the House several weeks ago. That was fair language, but now they say that the parity principle shall be done away with, and that wheat be sold for feed and that the corn people be forgotten. If this bill passes there will be no commercial price for corn, because the price will be exactly that which the Secretary of Agriculture happens to want it to be. He made a speech at Atlanta on February 28 and said at that time that he could sell pool wheat and other commodities at prices below parity, and corn went down the next day 5 cents a bushel in the Chicago market. That is what the Secretary of Agriculture might again do to you if this motion passes. However, I hold him in respect, but I know that this is unfair class legislation of a vicious type. It will not reduce feed surpluses, as now claimed, because every bushel of wheat sold for feed will displace other feeds and leave surpluses exactly as before. That argument is spurious. You have no right to rob Peter in order to pay Paul.

I know what the cattle barons of the West want. They want cheap feed and to force down corn prices, but they have no regard for the tenant farmers or the farmers on the ordinary farm homes and lands throughout the country. They seem to think that these farmers should be mendicants and live on the alms that Congress might vote as parity payments to them. These parity appropriations will cease some day. We nearly lost the parity appropriation 4 years ago. Farmers would like to sell their products for good prices and for parity prices, and for cost of production or profit prices without regimentation, and in the open markets. And if this motion carries, then parity as a principle is lost, and it is lost forever. Outside of the war effort, we have no more momentous question before Congress. I cannot make a full statement in the 3 minutes given to me but thank the chairman for a chance to say this much.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer, living on my farm, and I have raised in my time 2,000,000 bushels of wheat. I sold it as low as 18 cents a bushel and as high as \$2.50 a bushel. We are faced with a serious condition in the wheat world. If we do not harvest a single bushel of wheat this year, on the 1st of October we will have an ordinary carry-over. We have to do something

about it. Our foreign markets are entirely gone. The Government gives us 85 percent of parity on a loan. The farmers take advantage of that and sell their wheat to the Government. The Government today has millions of bushels on hand. If wheat is used for feed, it must compete with the price of corn. It must be sold for 85 percent of the parity price of corn. It has about the same value as corn for feeding. I have fed thousands of bushels of it, and I know something about it. It is in the interest of the wheat farmer, as well as of the livestock producers, to allow the Government to dispose of these millions of surplus bushels.

The world today has a 3-year supply on hand. There is now no market for it. Allow the Government to dispose of this at the parity price for corn. I saw my section go broke from end to end on 25-cent wheat. If the control of the Government should be removed from the price of wheat today, it would not be worth 25 cents a bushel. You could not sell it. Nobody would dare put any money into it. There is no warehouse room for it. There is a tremendous supply.

Now, let us consider this matter from the point of view of the stockmen. We are going to need greatly increased production of livestock in the United States if we are going to be able to furnish our own people with their average amount of meat and at the same time furnish our Allies with a substantial amount.

Livestock production can only be increased when the ratio of livestock prices to feed grains is favorable. At the present time we have a fair supply of feed grains, but a very large increase of livestock is on the way, and to bring this livestock to maturity will take a larger amount of grain than is or will be available.

To make up for the shortage in feed grain it is extremely desirable that wheat be made available to livestock feeders at a price comparable to corn. We have a very large surplus of wheat. If this can be made available to livestock feeders at prices about equal to corn at 85 percent of parity, most feeders would turn to wheat whenever their feed supply of corn or other grains ran short.

This 125,000,000 bushels, which we ask the privilege of selling, is the product of about 10,000,000 acres. A few years ago we had 80,000,000 acres in wheat. This year we have 55,000,000 acres. If we cannot dispose of the surplus, we may expect the wheat acreage to be cut one-third. The total allowance is already greatly reduced and the wheat farmer now faces legislation for a further cut.

The Senate Appropriations Committee approved a provision that would enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat to livestock feeders at prices not lower than 85 percent of parity for corn. If we are to obtain maximum livestock production, it is extremely important that the House conferees accept this provision.

Vote for the Cochran amendment.
[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first let me observe that I share with our majority leader the belief that this should not be couched on sectional grounds. As a matter of fact, there is involved the principle, there is involved the faith, there is involved the whole question of the general welfare. How singular it is that in the page preceding the page on which these amendments appear we wrote into this bill before it left the House this language:

The Under Secretary is authorized and directed to make such additional commitments or incur such additional obligations as may be necessary in order to provide for full parity payments.

That is the language of the bill as passed by both the House and the Senate. You will find it recorded on page 78. Now we propose, by considering a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, to torpedo the principle which has been assured to the rice farmer, the tobacco farmer, the cotton farmer, the corn farmer, the wheat farmer ever since 1933. Are you going to run out on them? Maybe you will. I do not propose to do so today.

Let me observe also, and meaning no effrontery whatsoever, that it is rather regrettable that this amendment has not been carefully read. What does it say? First, let us look at it in terms of what we wrote in on the House side. We provided that sales could be made below parity on four different bases. The first one was if a sale was exclusively for relief. Secondly, a sale could be made below parity if it was deteriorated grain, for feed. Third, you could sell below parity if it was deteriorated grain, for alcohol; finally, if it was normal grain which was being used for seed.

Now comes the Senate with its language, and let us examine what it will do, because there is much misapprehension today. Here is what the Senate language will do: Any kind of grain can be sold for less than parity if it is for relief. That is identical with the House language.

Secondly, if it is deteriorated grain and is sold for feed or for alcohol.

Third, if it is any grain—any grain, corn, or wheat, except there is a limitation that when you sell wheat for that you are limited to 125,000,000 bushels and the price must be not less than 85 percent of corn parity. Is it not paradoxical, is it not ridiculous that the same farmer can take a wagon over here and put his wheat into a loan and get \$1.15 as a loan from the Federal Government, and take another wagon and buy some of this same wheat for grain at 80 cents a bushel? You had better read the language. You are going to torpedo the farmers; and I will say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], not only the corn farmers but the wheat farmers as well. Read the limitation. It says "not more than 125,000,000 bushels," for what? For feeding purposes. They are mixing corn and wheat in proportions of 50-50 for alcohol. We are charged with the production of 575,000,000 gallons of high-proof alcohol for the dehydration of

powder. It takes a half a pound of alcohol to dehydrate a pound of smokeless or TNT powder. They will use corn. They will use wheat below parity because the limitation of 125,000,000 bushels applies only to feed wheat.

What is going to happen to our corn farmers? Our distilleries are not manufacturing gin and whiskey today. They are going to start producing for Uncle Sam.

Mr. Jones appeared before the Gillette Committee and said, "We allocated 200,000 tons of rubber out of a program of 1,000,000 tons to grain alcohol." It will take an awful lot of alcohol, and all of it, under the provisions of this bill, can be sold for any price that you can get for corn and wheat. What is going to happen to the farmers' market? Butyl alcohol, acetone, ethyl alcohol, and rubber are all exempted in the Senate language. That will include not only wheat from Kansas and Oklahoma, but it will include corn as well, and your market will be gone, and nothing can stop it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that for the last 3 years the price of both corn and wheat has not been made on the open market, but solely by means of Government loans, and is it not further the fact that those sales will not in any way affect the Government loan price?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only way you can get a market price on corn is corn that goes into industry; the Corn Products Refining Co. and the distilleries. That is all that establishes the market price unless you have a loan. But look at what this language says:

Provided further, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes.

That is the language. Does it say anything about any industrial use? Does it say anything about use for any other purpose for less than the other limitation which is 85 percent of the parity price of corn? If they are equivalent in food value, as the gentleman from Oregon has indicated, why should you want to sell wheat for 85 percent of corn parity and penalize the corn farmers of the country?

Mr. PIERCE. Because you have such a tremendous surplus of wheat and you have not of corn. We just want to get into your feed yard awhile.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We will take a loss anyway, but if you follow this language of the motion on the desk today you are going to torpedo the whole agriculture-adjustment program; that is what you are going to do.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman knows as well as I do that it is a fixed price, a legislated price; we have abolished and suspended the law of supply and demand on wheat, cotton, and corn.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. The pitiful thing is that it is all in the name of the farmer when as a matter of fact the profit is going to the manufacturer of mixed feed and the

manufacturer of alcohol at the expense of the consumers in the last analysis.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from South Carolina that under the Senate language 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be used for feed at a price which is below parity. The grain that will go into the production of 200,000 tons of rubber will be sold without regard for parity; whatever goes into relief will go without regard to parity; whatever goes into powder—600,000,000 gallons of alcohol, which means 250,000,000 bushels of grain—will be without regard for parity. What will happen to the farmer?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the fact that Henderson has placed a price ceiling on cattle and now is about to amend that order by lowering it to the extent of possibly 75 cents a hundred pounds? This means it will be impossible for corn feeders to receive parity for the corn if Henderson is going to insist on breaking the price ceiling.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us not be in the ridiculous position appearing on page 78, "full parity," but on page 80 saying, "Disregard parity."

Mr. TARVER. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, let us not approach this proposition under any misapprehension. Of all the votes cast in this session of Congress none is more significant or so far reaching in consequences and future implications. And of all the votes cast in this Congress, from the day it convened until now, there is none of deeper political import than the vote you are about to cast on this amendment.

We have heard a great deal of surmise as to who favors the amendment. But there can be no doubt about who is against it.

Every member of the conference committee representing the House on both sides of the aisle, comprising the entire subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, after a study of the question covering months, after taking testimony from all departmental representatives, and after hearing from the farmers and the country, are unanimously against it. Every farm organization in the United States is against it. As difficult as it is to get unanimity of action on the part of groups from all sections of the country, they are a unit on this question.

The National Grange, the Council of Farm Cooperatives, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers' Union, the Missouri Farmers Association, all present a united front against this insidious effort to subvert the principle of parity with which the farmer's one hope of bare remuneration for his indispensable part in the war program is inextricably linked—every farm organization in the United States is against this amendment. Every farm journal, every farm paper in the United States which has

carried a statement on the subject is against it because they know the devastating effect such a law would have on the individual farmer, on American agriculture, and on the economics of the Nation as a whole.

And who is for the amendment? Why, you have had the opportunity to observe for yourself here this afternoon. My friend, for whom I have the warmest regard, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, tells us frankly that he has not a farm in his district. My good friend from Missouri, one of the most lovable men in the House, JACK COCHRAN, has not got a farm in his district.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, yes; he has.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, yes. I overlooked the county poor farm. And my colleague on the committee, the able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who so ardently champions the amendment—what is his normal attitude toward farm legislation? Never in his life, never in his entire service in this Congress has he supported parity payments or any other measure to insure farm parity, never has he voted for any proposal to increase the price of farm products. It would be an amazing reversal of form if he should at this late date take any other position. He is sound on most questions, he has rendered invaluable service in preparation for the war and in the prosecution of the war; but he belongs to that school of thought which wants to fight the war at the farmers' expense while everybody else revels in the highest wages and highest profits the world ever saw.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I deeply regret that my time is so limited. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Much has been made of the statement that the different branches of agriculture should stick together—that they have a common cause in their opposition to this amendment. The wisdom of such a course is self-evident. Those who are endeavoring to take the farmer's wheat from him without consulting him on the price have sedulously endeavored to leave the impression with the producers of other farm products that this legislation will affect wheat prices only—that the price of other agricultural commodities will not be affected. The course of the markets belie such conclusions in a remarkable manner. The prices of all farm products have been slowly advancing as parity advanced in response to the precipitous rise of all factors on which computations of parity are based. But following the drafting of this amendment the price of all farm products dropped uniformly in sympathy with the drop in the price of wheat. Here is a market report from the Journal of Commerce of June 9:

GRAIN QUOTATIONS CONTINUE DECLINE

Wheat tumbled more than 2 cents, rye more than 3 cents, and soybeans 3 and 3½ cents.

Wheat came within about 1 cent of the 8 months lows posted last week. July oats equaled last week's 1942 low, some soybean

futures were at new bottom figures for the season, and all rye contracts hit lows not quoted here since November.

**NEW LOWS REACHED IN COTTON FUTURES—
WEEK'S LOSSES \$6 A BALE**

Prices reached new lows since early January, with the July and October positions selling well below 18 cents. Since a week ago Monday the market has declined 119 to 125 points.

The prices of farm products are so related that when you vote to depress the price of one you vote to eventually wreck the price of every farm commodity grown.

Mr. Speaker, although the farmer is doing more to win this war than any other worker in America, agriculture has received less legislative consideration than any other industry in the land. Congress has voted wages, prices, profits, and income for every other group. We gave the railroads the Transportation Act guaranteeing them returns on watered stock. We gave labor the wages-and-hours law and the National Labor Relations Board, and placed a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours. We gave the industry a law guaranteeing both wages for their labor and profits for their investors. We stabilized the oil industry with the hot-oil bill. And the farm Congressmen voted for all of them, because the farmer believes in fair wages and fair prices and a decent standard of living.

But when the farmer asked for his turn at the legislative mill to enable him to pay the increased costs of living and production imposed by the laws enacted for other groups, he was shouldered aside. The only response to his importunities for enough to pay for his shipping costs, his labor products, his coal, oil, and gas for his tractor and other items artificially priced by law, was the grudging grant of bare parity where others were receiving as much as three and a half times parity. And now it is proposed by this amendment to take away from him even the hard-won principle of parity.

And here let me disabuse the minds of many who are constantly making the statement that the basic period of parity was the period in which farmers received high prices. The period of 1909-14 was a period of inadequate farm prices. No farmer was able to make a competence in those years. If he made ends meet and held onto his farm in those years the steady increment in the price of land permitted him to retire in his old age. But it was not on his earnings. It was on the gradual increase in the value of his land. The period of high farm prices was in 1919 and 1920 and again in 1929. Prices were two or three times higher in those years than during the basic period of parity.

But what is the specific proposition embodied in this amendment? It is a proposition to take away from men the products of their labor without consulting them as to the price. It is Government confiscation in that they are allowed no voice whatever in dictating the terms under which their property is sequestered. It is a proposition to fix the wages of labor because the price of agricultural products is the farmer's wage. They propose to send men out into the

field to labor all long days at a wage which is fixed by law. The law says how much he shall get for his labor and the farmer gets that much and no more, regardless of the fact that every other wage earner negotiates his pay. There is no other class in America subject to such arbitrary impressment. American labor universally has the right of collective bargaining, and no one has made a stronger fight for labor's right to collective bargaining than I have.

It is an old fallacy. It goes back to medievalism. They tried that back in the ill-starred reign of Richard the Second. In the year 1350 Parliament passed a law in which they fixed the price the farms, and the farmers alone, should receive for their products and the wage the farms and the farmers alone should receive for labor.

And now this amendment proposes to go back 600 years and try it all over again. It did not work then and it will not work now. The farmer will make any sacrifice anybody else will make, but he refuses to be made the exception. The farmers of 1776 protested the fixing of taxes without representation and the farmers of 1942 will protest just as vigorously the fixing of wages and prices without representation. There was a day when the farmers, isolated and unorganized, knew little of the factors affecting their economy. But today, thanks to radio and the press, the people of the agricultural sections of the country are as well informed as anybody and at last they are organizing. And you may expect to hear from them in no uncertain terms when the news of today's proceeding is broadcast from this floor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Cochran motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the nays had it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on the division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—yeas 57, noes 125.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 87 and 88, which involve the same matter, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 82, strike out lines 3 to 11, inclusive.

Amendment No. 88: Page 82, after line 11, insert the following: "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, there is hereby reappropriated for the fiscal year 1943 the unobligated balances of the funds made available for the purposes of such section 32 for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. Such sums shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other appropriations made by such section or for the purposes of such section."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 87 and 88 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 90: On page 84, line 19, strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 90 and 91 be considered together, since they involve the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment numbered 91.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 91: On page 84, line 22, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 90 and 91 and concur therein.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations reported this bill to the House with provision for making available by loan \$45,000,000 for the farm-tenant land purchase program. This amount was \$5,000,000 in excess of the Budget estimate. The House later in the consideration of the bill on the floor reduced the amount of the proposed loan program to \$25,000,000. The Senate has restored the amount to \$40,000,000, which is exactly the Budget estimate.

In the fund provided for the administration of these loan funds, the Senate figure of \$2,000,000, in which in the motion I have made I have asked the House to concur, is \$500,000 under the Budget estimate. Therefore, if you should agree to the motion I have submitted, the net result would be that the money made available for this program would be \$500,000 less than the Budget estimate.

I do not want at this late hour of the day to enter into a detailed discussion of the farm-tenant land-purchase program, because we have discussed it here

so many times that it is unlikely that any Member, certainly not I, would be able to add anything to the store of knowledge the House may have on that subject.

This is a program which is paying for itself. It is a program where the percentage of repayments of current liabilities of borrowers is in excess of 99 percent, a much higher percentage than the percentage of repayments of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to business in this country.

When the overpayments or prepayments are taken into consideration the amount which has been repaid is, as I recall it, approximately, 120 percent of the obligations which have become due. It is not a program which is as widespread as some of us would like to have it because of the comparatively small amount of money involved, but it certainly has accomplished a great deal in aid of a class of people in this country who are urgently in need of assistance and it is not costing the Government of the United States anything like as much as the Government is suffering in financial loss in the extension of aid to the business interests of the country through the instrumentality of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I do not care to discuss the matter at any greater length. The authorization for this program is \$50,000,000. The Senate has provided only the amount of the Budget estimate which is \$5,000,000 below the amount which was approved by the Appropriations Committee in the House and I certainly hope there can be a settlement of the issue here involved for this session of the Congress at least by receding and concurring in the Senate amendments.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman would not make it plain that this does not involve an appropriation of money to be paid out to somebody, but this is loaned for the purpose of buying these farms and the Government has been getting the money back.

Mr. TARVER. I think the House understands that that is the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, first I am a little amused that my chairman of the subcommittee should ask to have all the rules and precedents of the past set aside. Here in the House and in every committee when a motion is only tied, it is always defeated and that ought to hold good even when it gets down to where it is hot.

If there is any argument for setting anything aside in these war times, it is for setting aside the land-purchase-tenant program. It has nothing to do with the emergency, nothing to do with defense. It is entirely outside of that. Here we are buying small farms or large farms for farmers. This is a bad time to buy farms. There is a little inflation in land values now and it is a poor idea for

anybody to buy a farm who expects to farm in the future, because when this war is over we know they are going to be cheaper.

Another thing involved is that labor is in demand on the farms. Buy a farm or furnish the money for a tenant to buy a farm in a period of depression and it is easy to help him. He is occupied on his own farm, but today he can get a job, and it is just as dignified to be an honorable hired man and to support your family that way as to be a poor landowner and owe the Government and everybody else. He can get a job on the farm, he can get a job any place today, and it is just like the W. P. A., or it is just like the C. C. C. They were to provide for unemployment and they were organized during the depression. This is less justified than the C. C. C. because they rendered some public service, as did also the W. P. A. Yet we have cut them in two or cut one out entirely and another in two. Land tenancy has nothing that would dovetail in with defense or with the emergency, nothing at all. Every argument and every reason is against buying these farms and putting these fellows to farming when the Government can use them all in the emergency for absolutely other things.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I do not understand the gentleman's statement that this is a relief measure. The gentleman knows, does he not, these tenant farmers are paying back this money and paying interest on it? How is that a relief measure?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is in the same category as the relief measures. It is to help people along by providing Government aid in loans. That was done when we were down in a depression, but there is less justification for this because this is a poor time to get them in debt. They can find good jobs otherwise, and in my country, as I have said before, it has always been just as dignified to be a hired man as to be an owing tenant. All of our good farmers today have been hired men, or half of them at least, in the years gone by.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us about when the Budget made up these figures that the chairman has referred to? He puts great emphasis on the fact that the figures here presented are in conformance with the Budget. When were those Budget figures made up?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think the most of them were made up last fall.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, they were made before Pearl Harbor?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Before we declared war?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Before we got into this trouble, this terrible catastrophe that is world-wide?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if there is anything we can do constructively to help the war effort, it is to eliminate some of these things which add to inflation, about which the whole country is burning up today. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is fine. I challenge anybody to present anything that we could more beneficially get rid of during this emergency than this farm tenancy program. If anyone knows of anything that could be more effectively submerged in this emergency, I challenge him to mention it.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HULL. I suggest possibly the \$65,000,000 loan made to the Argentine farmers. That might be eliminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the adoption of the motion of the chairman of the subcommittee to recede and concur in the Senate amendments. This tenant farm purchase program was debated very thoroughly in the House several years ago, and we adopted the principle of making annual appropriations to assist in this program. We afterward changed from appropriating funds for the purpose to authorizing loans from the R. F. C. We have legislative authorization for \$50,000,000. This authorization for loans is \$10,000,000 under that, or \$40,000,000. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], who preceded me, said that this program is like the W. P. A., or other relief programs. This is essentially not a relief program. It is one to further the aspirations of the poorer class of farmers of our country, to offer them a chance of becoming the owners of their own farms. That is the American ideal, and this bill is in furtherance of the American ideal, so that every man may be given the opportunity to own land in his own right.

Secretary Wickard is asking the farmers of the country to assist in the food-for-victory program. It is recognized that the larger farms of the country are producing probably up to their limit, and that the increase in production will come from the small farms of the country. Therefore, this program will assist in the food-for-victory program. This is a most democratic program. The tenants who are considered for the purchase of these farms are carefully looked over by local committees of farmers, as you probably know. These are not grants handed out from Washington but are loans made by the R. F. C. to these farmers. They are paid back over a period of 40 years, with an interest rate of 3 percent. As was told you when this bill was before the House in March, these loans have been repaid 99 percent. That was emphasized by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. Certainly, when the record is examined and it is found that these loans are repaid 99 percent

and when the tenants are selected by local committees, and when the program has been endorsed by this Congress by due legislation, it seems to me that we should go ahead and should not curtail the program that brings to every farmer in this country the hope that ultimately he may aspire to be an owner of his own land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let us find out what we are going to do. When this matter of farm-tenant loans was before the House before, it carried an administrative item for salaries, expenses, traveling, and so forth, of \$2,500,000. I offered an amendment to reduce it to \$1,250,000. We came in with an item for the farm-tenant purchases of \$40,000,000. That was reduced to \$25,000,000, the House cutting out \$15,000,000. Now, the action of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] proposes to concur in the Senate amendment which would restore \$750,000 of the administrative item for personnel, salaries, expenses, supplies, and so forth, and would restore \$15,000,000 that has been deleted by the House for farm-tenant purchase loans. My motion is that we ought to stand by the original action of the House for many reasons. In the first place, the figures submitted to the committee at the time would indicate that if you are going to buy a farm for everybody who wanted a farm and was in need, it would take 250 years, simply because more people are going into tenancy, and you will never quite catch up. If it is a 250-year program, certainly we can afford to suspend a portion of it for a while at a time when land values are going up.

The Secretary testified before our committee that land values had appreciated from 5 to 13 percent in different sections of the country. Are we going to carry on this program with more money to buy farms where values have appreciated and gone up, when in the post-war period we may take another loss? It seems to me we should hold this down to the bare minimum for a while.

They have had \$175,000,000 altogether for this purpose in the form of R. F. C. loans and direct appropriations. They have purchased close to 24,000 farms. Let us look at the farm credit situation. I have stated before that of the 3,600 farm associations, over 2,000 of them today are delinquent. They cannot make loans. What is the reason for it? It simply means that you have got a bad situation in farm credit, and you are going to throw good money after bad. Most of these loans are maturing at the present time. Let a few more years of experience pile up and then see what the situation will be. That is when we will come to grips with this real problem.

Oh, they say this is R. F. C. money. Is it not strange that every time Mr. Jesse Jones runs out of money or runs out of the limit of borrowing or issuing debentures he comes over to Mr. STEAGALL's committee and says, "I need a larger

allowance for the issuance of notes, bonds, and debentures. I need more money with which to operate." So ultimately it gets back to the people, and if there are any losses they have to be absorbed out of the Federal Treasury.

Finally, there is enough money in the bill now with which to make 4,500 farm-tenant loans in 1943. Certainly in a crucial period like this the making of 4,500 loans, and a slight diminution of this program, would be ample for all purposes.

So I respectfully submit, in deference to the position that we have taken before and in deference to the fact that the conferees were split 4 and 4, the motion of the gentleman from Georgia should be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall only take a minute for the reason that this question was fully debated in the House when the bill was passed, and this identical question decided by an overwhelming vote.

It is not merely that this plan does not solve the question of tenancy, because tenancy has increased steadily all the time it has been in effect, but even if it were effective, the proposition involves a nonessential expenditure. It is the predominant conviction of this House and certainly the predominant conviction of the country that for the present we should eliminate all nonessential expenditures; that we should devote every resource in this time of national peril to winning the war. This appropriation will not help to win the war. It offers no contribution to the national military program. It is a nonessential expenditure. It can wait until after the armistice. Let us win the war and then take up these minor domestic problems. I submit that we should again, as we did the last time the question was before the House, decisively reject this proposition to spend \$42,000,000 in nonessential philanthropy.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH].

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I think we should look very carefully into this matter before we vote against the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. In the first place, we are talking about cutting down expenditures and saving money, yet we are undertaking it in a manner that would do neither. The \$15,000,000 involved in the amendment is money that will be loaned to the farmers at 3 percent interest. Will it be paid back? We can only look at the history of the program to determine that. The history of the program justifies us in believing that it will all be repaid.

To my way of thinking, there is more involved here than a few million dollars. Throughout the world today the men who are fighting for their various homelands are fighting pretty much in proportion as the people in those countries own the homes for which they are fighting. In other words, a man becomes a better citizen; he becomes a more loyal citizen;

he becomes a better soldier during a time of crisis if he owns his home. He has more to fight for. For instance, today in Russia the Russian peasant is fighting as few men have ever fought before in the history of the world, because he loves the soil and is a part of the soil, and he will pay any price, even to that of his life, to defend it from an invading foe.

I certainly do not say that the outcome of this war, so far as America is concerned, depends upon the Tarver amendment, but I should like to point out to you that there is something of value involved in this thing. You cannot compare it with N. Y. A., C. C. C., or W. P. A. There is no comparison, so far as our public debt is concerned. The money this Congress appropriated a few days ago for N. Y. A. is money that will not be repaid. I am not criticizing that, but I do say to you that the money involved in this amendment is money that will be lent to the various deserving farmers of this country for the purpose of acquiring homes and that every dollar of it will be paid back with 3 percent interest. The only way it can be an expense to the Government is for the Government to have to pay more than 3 percent for its money, or if this money is not paid back, but the money is being paid back and the Government is borrowing its money for less than 3 percent. I say to you, in all candor and in all fairness, that it will not cost the Government any money; that it is a good thing and the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will it not be necessary with this increase of funds for the Federal Government to borrow this \$15,000,000 in order to be able to release it to the farmers?

Mr. SOUTH. It has to borrow the money, certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then it increases the burden of borrowing money for the Government at this time when we are selling bonds to prosecute the war.

Mr. SOUTH. Does the gentleman think it will be paid back?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even though it may be paid back, the gentleman knows we shall have to borrow every dollar for it, as well as to prosecute the war.

Mr. SOUTH. Does the gentleman mean to say these loans are not being paid back into the Treasury?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a little difficult to follow all the gentleman's questions.

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUTH. I yield.

Mr. FOAGE. The Government is borrowing money for considerably less than 3 percent and lending it at 3 percent, and the money is being paid back, so there is actually a profit on the deal.

Mr. SOUTH. That is absolutely correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking about this quite a bit. Everybody, I believe, realizes that I am rather conservative, and I do not like to see this Government borrow any more money than it has to borrow, but I have been impressed with this one fact: That we can borrow money and give it or lend it to every foreign country in the world, but we cannot take care of \$50,000,000 to lend to the people of this country. I read in the newspaper last night where we had not even been asked by certain countries for help but we had offered to extend this lend-lease program to Poland, Belgium, and Greece. If we can borrow money to give to these foreign countries, or lend to them, we ought to be able to raise \$50,000,000 to look after the third of the people of this country who are underclothed, underfed, or do not know what they are going to do.

When this war is over—it does not make any difference how soon—some of these men are going to come back and be very glad to have a little bit of land, because there will not be any business left in this country and many people have got to go back to the farm.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he is going to publicly subscribe to a loan program with a 40-year repayment period at a 3 percent interest rate when the rest of the farmers have to pay 3½ percent and that farm loans under certain administration-proposed legislation is going to be more than 3½ percent?

Mr. JOHNS. I do not know anything about that; there is nothing said about that here or how much they are going to be charged for it. My contention is that if we can lend all kinds of funds to foreign countries we certainly can find a way to raise funds to take care of our own people; and I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin realizes that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has presented an unanswerable argument when he calls attention to the fact that we are lending millions of dollars to foreign governments, which we do not pretend to even express the hope that we will get back, and at the same time refusing to lend money to our own American farmers, whose sons are now defending us and our liberties, in order that they might purchase homes for themselves and their families.

Maybe it is necessary to make these vast loans to foreign governments. If such loans are essential to win the war, then the American people will offer no objection to them. The winning of the war at this time is more important than any other consideration, but I submit in all seriousness that to make such foreign loans which will not be repaid and refuse loans to the thousands of tenant farmers who are clamoring for an opportunity to own their own homes just does not make sense.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the record of the Farm Security Administration in administering these loans has been outstanding. The record of collections is almost unbelievable. More than 99 percent of the loans have actually been collected, a record unequaled in the history of any other agency of government. That not only speaks well for the Farm Security Administration, but it is also a glowing tribute to the 18,000 farmers who have been able to purchase farms under this program. It is a guaranty that the 8,000 additional farmers who may be able to purchase farms if the Senate amendment is agreed to will also pay back to the Government every dollar borrowed with interest. The fact is I am advised that many farmers under this program have paid 3, 4, and 5 years in advance in order to cut down the principal and save the interest. Yet, despite this remarkable record, there are Members who continue to stand on the floor of this House and refer to the farm-tenancy program as a gift or as wasteful extravagance.

I am glad of the part I have played in the initiation of this farm tenancy program. Some of us recall that it was not an easy task to get Congress to appropriate the first \$10,000,000 to start the program. It is well known that the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIKSEN], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and many other gentlemen, especially on the minority side, were bitterly opposed to this program from its very inception. With these gentlemen I have no quarrel. Considering the fact, however, that more than 60 percent of all the farmers in the State of Oklahoma do not own the land they till and that every one of them has a yearning in his breast for an opportunity of tilling his own soil, sitting under his own roof and by his own fireside, and the fact that a mighty forward step has been made in the direction of home ownership, I am proud of the active part I had in formulating the farm tenancy program and securing funds with which to operate. It occurs to me that the least this House could do would be to accept the Senate amendment, which is not a dollar above the Budget estimate and, if I remember correctly, \$10,000,000 below what was actually expended during the past fiscal year for this worth-while program.

I hold in my hand a telegram from Tom Cheek, president of the Farmers' Union of Oklahoma, in which he expresses the hope that Congress will adopt the Senate amendment and follow the President of the United States in this matter of giving aid and assistance to the American farmer and thus make sure that there will be no shortage of foods during this war. That is what this amendment proposes to do.

Please bear in mind that on the shoulders of the farmers of America rests the responsibility of feeding our vast Armies as well as our Allies in many of the far-flung parts of the world. Regardless of the guns, the planes, and the battleships that are so essential to the winning of the war, we must not forget that a good army must be well fed and well clothed. This program will encourage the farmers to stay on the farm

or return to the farm and grow the countless farm commodities that are so essential to the winning of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, our distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does not my good friend, who has always been a tower of strength for all beneficial agricultural legislation, believe that we could defer this legislation until after the war and then buy this land cheaper and thereby place a smaller burden upon the man who buys it and must ultimately pay for it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the chairman for his compliment. Answering his question, I would say, first, that it is only a matter of conjecture as to how long this war will last or what will happen to land prices when this war is over. However, if I recall correctly, for several months, maybe a year or so, after World War No. 1, the price of land actually advanced.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks three statements issued by the Treasury under date of May 9, June 1, and June 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 9, 1942.—Sale of United States Savings bonds for the first year of the defense savings program—from May 1, 1941, through April 30, 1942—totaled \$5,389,350,000, as compared with sales of \$935,191,326 of the old United States Savings bonds ("baby bonds") during the corresponding 12 months from May 1, 1940, through April 30, 1941, the Treasury Department announced today.

Comparative sales by months follow:

May 1940 through April 1941	
1940:	
May.....	\$61,171,766
June.....	45,253,723
July.....	65,838,577
August.....	49,411,194
September.....	43,142,160
October.....	48,402,306
November.....	46,320,821
December.....	76,486,179
1941:	
January.....	178,599,971
February.....	115,571,959
March.....	126,340,398
April.....	78,652,272
Total.....	935,191,326
May 1941 through April 1942	
1941:	
May.....	\$349,818,127
June.....	314,527,308
July.....	342,131,533
August.....	265,606,084
September.....	232,327,486
October.....	270,713,177
November.....	233,487,123
December.....	528,598,694
1942:	
January.....	1,060,546,352
February.....	703,200,345
March.....	557,891,869
April.....	530,501,925
Total.....	5,389,350,023

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 1, 1942.—May sales of War Savings Bonds were \$634,357,000 or 5.7 percent more than the \$600,000,000 quota set for the Nation during the month, Secretary Morgenthau announced today. In announcing that the first national monthly quota had been exceeded, the Secretary said the sale of War Bonds, by series, was divided as follows:

Series E bonds, \$421,831,000; series F, \$42,465,000; and series G, \$170,060,000.

The War Savings Bond quota for the Nation for June will be \$800,000,000, while the monthly quota for July and thereafter will be \$1,000,000,000.

Total cash deposits at the Treasury for all three series of bonds by months: May 1941, \$349,818,000; June \$314,527,000; July \$342,132,000; August, \$265,603,000; September, \$232,327,000; October, \$270,713,000; November, \$233,487,000; December, \$528,599,000; January, \$1,060,546,000; February, \$703,200,000; March, \$557,892,000; April, \$530,502,000; May, \$634,357,000. Total, May 1, 1941, through May 31, 1942, \$6,023,707,000.

All figures are rounded to nearest thousands, and will not necessarily add to totals.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1942.—The Treasury Department today announced the break-down by States in the sales of War Savings Bonds for the month of May.

The national quota for the month of May was \$600,000,000. National sales for the month were \$634,356,000, or more than 5.7 percent above the amount set. A table showing State sales for May follows:

Comparison of actual sales of War Savings bonds, series E, F, and G, by States, May 1942, with quotas established for the month
[In thousands of dollars]

State	Actual sales	Quota	Difference	Per-cent actual sales to quota
Alabama.....	5,285	3,787	1,498	139.6
Arizona.....	1,066	1,358	608	144.8
Arkansas.....	3,556	2,682	874	132.6
California.....	41,225	40,011	1,214	103.0
Colorado.....	4,327	4,086	241	105.9
Connecticut.....	16,518	13,228	3,290	124.9
Delaware.....	1,649	1,861	-212	88.6
District of Columbia.....	5,958	6,179	-221	96.4
Florida.....	6,716	5,794	922	115.9
Georgia.....	6,439	5,365	1,074	120.0
Idaho.....	2,208	1,451	757	152.2
Illinois.....	52,227	49,300	2,927	105.9
Indiana.....	14,910	10,926	3,984	136.5
Iowa.....	13,870	9,000	4,870	154.1
Kansas.....	5,290	4,617	673	114.6
Kentucky.....	6,177	5,558	619	111.1
Louisiana.....	5,875	4,944	931	118.8
Maine.....	4,146	3,295	851	125.8
Maryland.....	8,392	9,079	-687	92.4
Massachusetts.....	28,738	28,771	-33	99.9
Michigan.....	26,240	21,647	4,593	121.2
Minnesota.....	12,574	11,657	917	107.9
Mississippi.....	3,698	2,905	793	127.3
Missouri.....	18,713	17,075	1,638	109.6
Montana.....	2,156	2,785	-629	77.4
Nebraska.....	4,590	3,286	1,304	139.7
Nevada.....	692	581	111	119.1
New Hampshire.....	2,165	1,895	273	114.4
New Jersey.....	22,889	20,727	2,162	110.4
New Mexico.....	1,185	1,055	130	112.3
New York.....	106,671	125,000	-18,329	85.3
North Carolina.....	8,190	5,889	2,301	139.1
North Dakota.....	2,059	1,393	666	147.8
Ohio.....	35,899	31,769	4,130	113.0
Oklahoma.....	5,919	5,389	530	109.8
Oregon.....	5,676	5,611	65	101.2
Pennsylvania.....	53,514	53,814	-300	99.4
Rhode Island.....	4,404	5,352	-948	82.3
South Carolina.....	3,097	2,453	644	126.3
South Dakota.....	1,731	1,239	492	139.7
Tennessee.....	6,484	5,141	1,343	126.1
Texas.....	22,479	18,594	3,885	120.9
Utah.....	2,057	1,201	856	171.3
Vermont.....	1,449	1,205	244	120.3
Virginia.....	9,092	8,965	127	101.4
Washington.....	11,082	7,581	3,501	146.2
West Virginia.....	4,032	4,103	-71	98.9
Wisconsin.....	12,280	11,977	303	102.5
Wyoming.....	984	1,093	-109	90.1
Alaska.....	492	198	294	248.5

Comparison of actual sales of War Savings bonds, series E, F, and G, by States, May 1942, with quotas established for the month—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]				
State	Actual sales	Quota	Difference	Per-cent actual sales to quota
Canal Zone.....	190	190	0	100.0
Hawaii.....	5,985	992	4,993	603.3
Puerto Rico.....	183	214	-31	85.5
Virgin Islands.....	9	9	0	100.0
Total.....	634,356	600,000	34,356	105.7

NOTE.—Figures in this table are based on preliminary telegraphic reports and are subject to revision.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury Division of Research and Statistics June 6, 1942.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the language of the pending bill provides that the money shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at 3 percent per annum. In order for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to get the money, it has to go to the Treasury of the United States. The Treasury has to go to the people and the banks of this country. At the present time the Treasury has a tremendous drive under way to have our people purchase a billion dollars worth of securities per month. In the month just closed we touched a fraction over \$600,000,000. The Treasury is calling for \$800,000,000 for June and \$1,000,000,000 per month from there on.

This is no time to increase the farm-tenant operations. When the price-control bill was before our committee, I interrogated Secretary Wickard in regard to this question of increased farm land prices, and I asked him what he thought the people of this country would do when they were driven out of the speculative market by the fixing of prices through the Price Administrator. He said in substance he had not given that too much thought. I told him, "You will see land values go up considerably." That was during last August that we were discussing this. Since then land values have gone up, and they will continue to go up as investors and speculators move out of these commodity markets into farm real estate. You are pitting the future of the farm tenant against the bids of the men who have the money to put into farms. This is no time to indulge in this program, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, if we have any economic sense of balance at all it is high time we began to use some of it. Any man who wants to be sensible and who can comprehend the gravity of a situation can well afford to heed the circumference of the \$200,000,000,000 war undertaking we are imposing upon the Nation and the financing problem which now confronts the Treasury of the United States. The forthcoming tax bill will necessarily impose burdens upon our people which they do not now comprehend but which will bear heavily upon their economic backs in the months to come. The financing burden that will rest upon the Treasury after its receipt of the greatly

increased tax revenue will be the most staggering any Treasurer has ever had to manage. It is not yet too clear just what type of program the Treasury will be forced to follow. We can well afford to eliminate from present financing every nonessential and nonwar project that is presented to us for consideration.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, my views regarding action on this amendment are similar to those expressed by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Congress has increased the limit of lending for the R. F. C. to approximately \$15,000,000,000. We have already appropriated about \$161,000,000,000 for war purposes and we are going to appropriate in a few days, probably without a dissenting vote, another \$39,000,000,000. It is all necessary to win the war.

While that has been going on, our Government has been extensively lending money to people in other nations. We have lent \$110,000,000 to Argentina, much of which is still in the banks of Argentina, not used. We lent them another \$65,000,000 for a farm program for Argentine farms. They made some use of that. Argentina recently sold 10,000 tons of corn at \$4 per ton to Uruguay to be used for fuel. We have loaned Mexico \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 and we are getting ready to lend them more. The papers today announce a loan of \$34,000,000 to develop the steel industry in Brazil. These are only a few of hundreds of such loans.

The only place where the shoe pinches, the only place in which we are called to account by some economy advocates regarding the extension of credit is when some poor farmer here at home wants to get a loan to buy a little piece of land out in my section or in some other section of the country. Then is when Congress commences to talk about the necessity of restricting loans.

Let me call your attention to this one fact in connection with those farmers. There are over 4,000,000 farmers in the United States who have an average income of less than \$500 a year, right in these times when everybody is talking about the increased cost of living, just as though the cost of living has not gone up on the farm.

According to departmental estimates the gross income of all the farmers for 1941 was less than 12 percent of the national income. The gross income of the small farm owners and tenant farmers was approximately two billions of dollars, or less than 2 percent of the national income, although they comprise 16 percent of the total population and certainly, the Senate amendment under discussion should be concurred in. The food supply of our Nation comes from small farms as well as larger plantations. The loans proposed will aid in insuring that food supply in the future as well as during the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will concur in the motion that has been offered by the gentleman from Georgia to increase the farm tenant loan provision from \$25,000,000 to \$40,000,000. I certainly concur in what both my colleagues who preceded me from my State have said. We evidently have money enough and never squabble about lending it to any group, including farmers in South America. Certainly the farmers of the Argentine or any other countries of the world are no more important than our own farmers. While I favor friendly relations with other countries, it seems to me that our own farmers should come first. I have not heard anybody objecting to providing a loan for other countries, and they were not for war purposes either.

When this bill was under consideration earlier, I read parts of hundreds of letters concerning this matter and noted the contentment those writers expressed over the fact that now they were able to own their own little homes, that they were making progress, that they felt happy about it and were contented. Then I have received dozens of letters, and I have no doubt that many of you are also getting them right along, from people trying to get a loan but who find there is no more money available for that purpose. This is not a gift but a loan, and the record of repayment is nearly perfect.

After all we must make progress to stem this tide of absentee ownership. We must do it. I think our duty first is to our own farmers, before we think about farmers in other sections of the world, as much as we approve of the good-neighbor policy. Therefore, I hope we will not turn down this motion because this program is self-sustaining, and it is not costing the Government any money. Certainly we ought to make it possible to continue the program so our tenants can get this assistance and become farm owners.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 47, noes 90.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote just had, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 90 and 91.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93: On page 86, line 16, strike out "\$3,341,182" and insert "\$3,295,575."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 95 and 96 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: On page 87, line 3, strike out "\$25,319,557" and insert "\$50,319,557."

Senate amendment No. 96: On page 88, line 9, strike out "\$70,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 95 and 96.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 97: On page 89, line 7, after "program" insert "except for the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 97.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 101 and 102, which involve the same question, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 101: On page 93, line 13, strike out "5" and insert "10."

Senate amendment No. 102: On page 93, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "10."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 101 and 102.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions in the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) today, and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the Agricultural Appropriation bill today have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING AND AMENDING CERTAIN EMERGENCY LAWS RELATING TO THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes, for the consideration of which a rule has been granted.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of each of the following acts and resolutions, and all authority thereunder, are hereby continued in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the present war shall have been proclaimed or, in the case of any one or more of such acts and resolutions, until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate: Public Resolution No. 74, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved May 14, 1940; Public Resolution No. 82, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 11, 1940; Public No. 831, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 10, 1940; Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1941; Public Law 101, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 6, 1941; Public Law 173, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 14, 1941; and all authority of the Commission under such acts and resolutions, insofar as the same pertains to functions and duties of the Commission transferred to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration by the President's Executive order of February 7, 1942 (No. 9054; 7 Federal Register 837), shall be performed by such Administrator in conformity with such Executive order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply extends the effective time of some existing laws that are scheduled to expire on certain dates as emergency legislation.

As to the first law there was some confusion about the expiration date as no definite date was fixed. The others contain the date of June 30, 1942, except one law which expires June 30, 1943. This measure brings uniformity as to the time prescribed for this particular legislation. There was no opposition to the joint resolution in committee, and no opposition to the granting of a rule in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after the committee had heard the explanation of the gentleman from Virginia when appearing before the Rules Committee, they unanimously agreed that a rule should be granted, and I am pleased that unanimous consent has been granted the gentleman to call up the measure without the rule. It is a meritorious bill and should be passed.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 492) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a communication received from the Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Fresno Bee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made this afternoon by including a telegram from the president of the National Farmers' Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders for today I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from the Mansfield News-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the Governor of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two resolutions passed by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article in the Washington Post this Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, after the special orders today I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7041, making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The Senate added a legislative rider to this bill. The Comptroller General rendered a decision which prevented select committees of the House from calling on all departments and independent agencies for certain help in connection with their investigations. They have been running wild, even going so far as to demand that the heads of some of the departments and agencies appoint men. They would insist they be put on their pay roll, and then delegate them to serve with the select committees. The Comptroller General very properly held he would take exceptions to the paying of such men and also went much further in saying who could and who could not serve on select committees. The Comptroller General rendered a real public service. In my opinion this is a matter for the legislative committees of the House.

If it is to be done it should be done by joint resolution, and should come to the Committee on Expenditures for hearings. This is legislation on an appropriation bill, and if it had been presented on the floor of the House it would have been subject to a point of order. In view of that, I ask the gentleman from Texas if he will not bring the amendment back for a special vote in the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to which the gentleman refers is very far reaching indeed, and applies not only to matters affecting the District of Columbia, but to all other appropriation bills, and is so far reaching that I think he can be assured that the conferees will give due consideration to the matter and if we should decide to agree to it that we will certainly bring the matter back for a separate vote in the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I will say it does not apply to the District of Columbia, but applies generally to Government departments and independent agencies, and has no place on this bill.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. MAHON, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. BEAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. LAMBERTSON.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COSTELLO. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs have until midnight to file a con-

ference report and statement upon the pay bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WAR-DAMAGE INSURANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I might bring to the attention of the House a matter which I consider important. The Secretary of Commerce, in a press release dated June 2, in explanation of the coverage provided by a war-damage insurance policy, states that the policies will be issued for a 12-month period, to cover physical loss of real and personal property which may result from enemy attacks or action of our own forces in resisting enemy attacks.

I am sure it was the intention of Congress to protect the people against all sorts of damage arising out of our military activities. For example, over our country today there are flying Canadian planes. Canada is a friendly nation, but that does not prevent them from having plane accidents. Bombs might fall from their carriers or the plane might fall. Under the language of the War Damage Insurance Act, a person whose property is damaged by one of these Canadian planes might find it impossible to collect one penny for his damages. Should our planes, while flying over the United States on a false alarm, have trouble and damage property, the property owners might find their claims contested on the grounds that there was no "enemy attack or action of our own forces in resisting enemy attack."

I am inclined to believe that the War Damage Insurance Corporation and the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jones, should be willing to amend that provision in the policy so as to meet contingencies of the sort I suggested, but unfortunately, the interpretation of the policy coverage as given by the War Damage Corporation seems to exclude any damage except damage resulting from actual enemy attack or resisting enemy attack.

Because there are thousands of planes flying over our cities, and the number of accidents which are occurring, it is our duty to restate for the benefit of the War Damage Corporation, on behalf of our constituents, that it was the intention of Congress to cover every home owner whose property was damaged as a result of war activity not specifically excluded.

Under this act, unless we are resisting attack, your constituent might not be covered. If that plane, flying over from Canada on a peaceful mission should do any damage, there would also be the possibility that liability would be denied under the act.

I have discussed these problems with folks in the War Damage Insurance Corporation and, as a result of those discussions, I am of the opinion that there is a sympathetic feeling to my proposal to extend the language so as to specifically include the damage I have described. I ask every Member of Congress to give this subject his special attention, and if

you agree with me, communicate your views to the War Damage Insurance Corporation.

The policy form is now being prepared and millions of copies will go out in the next few days, as the insurance goes into effect July 1. We should have this matter settled before that time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman explain how it would be possible for this damage to occur by planes flying over New York?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Let us assume there was a false air-raid alarm; a plane went out and something might happen to its mechanism from which great damage might ensue. Under the interpretation given the existing law by the War Damage Insurance Corporation there might be some question as to coverage. Let us take a plane crossing from Canada, through some mishap it might fall. There would be serious doubt as to liability under this policy, and still no one would say this was not in connection with our war activities.

Mr. JENSEN. Would it not be rather difficult to determine whether the damage was caused on account of a false alarm?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Oh, I do not want to restrict it to a false alarm. If damage results from the operation of an Army or Navy plane in the ordinary course of its duty in connection with war activities—and they are all war activities now—the owner of that property should be covered by war damage insurance, because after all it is part and parcel of our war activities. Let us give as much protection to the home and property owner as possible and not seek to limit it in any way or make doubtful his right of recovery because of an unhappy choice of language.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. THILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE RADIO

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the invention of the radio has perhaps done more to bring back home life and home entertainment than any other single force generated in the last 50 years. The automobile and many other inventions did much to disrupt home life. The automobile, in particular, was an agency that took people from their homes and led to a great extent in the development of mass centers of entertainment, such as the roadhouse and similar institutions.

The radio made it possible for people to gather in the evenings in their homes and listen to varied forms of entertainment that seemed to improve as the life of radio extended. People were provided with both entertainment and knowledge. Learned professors and savants in all fields of human endeavor lectured to our people and helped to improve their intellectual standards. The finest actors of the spoken stage portrayed the great roles of the theater. The comedian gave that degree of lightness and froth that was necessary to bring about a well-established and balanced life.

The American standards of broadcasting both as to quality and quantity were far beyond the wildest dreams of any European network. Lately, however, there has been a great reduction in quality. There has been a tendency on the part of the so-called comedians to engage in salaciousness at the expense of humor. Anyone who knows the theater in America is well aware that its decline was brought about by the introduction of lewdness, obscenity, and salaciousness. The introduction of these factors made it almost impossible at certain times for people who respected each other to attend a theatrical performance jointly. A few of the old-time managers and producers, such as the great George M. Cohan, endeavored to carry on for a clean stage, but they were not very successful. Now if radio intends to turn the same corner that led the stage to destruction, I think we must protest.

Broadcasting is not a natural right. It is a licensed privilege, and as a privilege it should be treated with respect by those who have been given this license and who have made fortunes for themselves, their sponsors, and their writers. While I do not desire censorship of the radio, being too great a believer in the privilege of free speech, I cannot fail to take cognizance of the fact that no man, no matter how strong the guaranty of free speech, can walk the streets of our cities and towns and call out indecent and salacious statements. Neither have these companies or sponsors the right to pump into our homes that which is not clean. We, who buy the products, are assembled fathers and mothers, boys and girls, young and old, and we insist that the sanctity of our homes be preserved. Can it be that these funny men have such a limited intellect that they have already exhausted all fun-making possibilities, and must now go back to the filth of their burlesque-house beginnings? Are they admitting to the world their intellectual limitations?

I know what their response will be. They will say that they are good, patriotic Americans. That at the present time they are traveling from camp to camp giving entertainment to the men in service. Do not be misled by this hiding behind the flag, for these sponsored programs given in the various camps are the best form of advertising for both the sponsors and the performers. They are all receiving exactly the same salaries that they received when the programs emanated from commercial studios. If these performances did not have the ad-

ditional advertising value, they would not be made.

If the broadcasting industry does not attempt to clean its stables, I can assure them that the effort will be made from other sources. I do not promise them this, I pledge it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if, as the President has said, the purpose of gasoline rationing in the Midwest is to conserve tires, I suggest that there is a better way to do it.

Leon Henderson's repeated threats that he may requisition tires and automobiles so as to save rubber, is doing more to encourage nonessential driving in our part of the country than any other circumstance.

Quite a few of our people instinctively distrust Mr. Henderson. Some of them even think he would like to deprive them of their cars so as to make them "feel" the war. To put the Midwest, where gasoline is plentiful, under the same rationing rules as the East, where it is done because of the gas scarcity, they point out, seems heartless, unjust, and incompetent. Like the fable of the fox who lost his tail in a trap and then tried to persuade other foxes to cut off their tails also.

In our part of the country distances between towns are so much greater, business is so much more dependent upon automobiles that the effect of rationing will inevitably be more devastating economically than here where most of us who are deprived of our automobiles can hop a bus or taxicab and take rides on unlimited gasoline.

If the President or Henderson will see fit to assure the people that in the Midwest there will be no seizure by the Government of motorcars which are used chiefly for essential business purposes, farming, delivering, and so forth, giving the people a clear idea of what should be considered essential driving, I believe that you will see soldierly cooperation. Our midwestern citizens are exceeding quotas in enlistments, war savings stamps, and other expressions of patriotism, and they will do the same with their tires.

Even now there is much less nonessential driving there than Mr. Henderson seems to believe. It is only that they are too sensible and too American to want to make unnecessary sacrifices, and nobody wants to be forced to give up his car to some politician to be used, perhaps, for "boondoggling."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to compliment the gentlewoman for saying "ray-tion-ing" instead of "rash-ioning." Let us take all the rats out of this thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PATRIOTISM OF THE WOMEN OF AMERICA

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the American women are doing a wonderful job. In every crisis the womanhood of this country always rises to the occasion. The present situation is a repetition of those earlier chapters of the history of the Republic. Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson all received unstinted and wholehearted support from the mothers of America. President Roosevelt is receiving it now. What a thrill almost a week ago when 13,500 women applied in 1 day for 450 officer-training enlistments.

San Francisco is the scene of intense activity. San Francisco is the focal point for the entire war picture on the west coast. Women volunteers are on 24-hour service at the Fourth Interceptor Command. Each woman works on a 6-hour shift and reports for duty every third day. Day and night other women furnish hot coffee to the soldiers on guard duty. Convenient kitchens are maintained at various places throughout the city. Then still other women meet incoming transports, seeing that the evacuees are properly cared for and speeded on their way to various destinations. Many cases are reported of women and children arriving from the Tropics not suitably clothed for our climate. In each case, without costing the recipient a penny, full outfits are furnished by the San Francisco chapter of the Red Cross.

Then we have Hospitality House, located in the Civic Center. These attractive clubrooms were built by volunteer labor, assigned by the San Francisco building trades without cost, and with materials furnished gratis by the city. Men from every section of the country visit Hospitality House. The various women's groups take turn in acting as hostesses. San Francisco is justly proud of the reception given to our boys in uniform.

Women from all walks of life are keenly interested to do whatever they may to help. On June 2, 1942, the San Francisco Call Bulletin published an editorial entitled "Women Train for Defense." In tribute to the women of San Francisco I am pleased to include this article as part of my remarks:

WOMEN TRAIN FOR DEFENSE—THROUGH THE AMERICAN WOMEN'S VOLUNTARY SERVICES, SAN FRANCISCO WIVES AND MOTHERS NOW MAY LEARN TO PROTECT THEIR HOMES

San Francisco branch of the American Women's Voluntary Services has initiated a program that may well become one of its finest contributions to the war effort.

It has arranged a series of lectures in neighborhood theaters throughout the city designed to acquaint San Francisco's mothers and housewives with the parts they can, and in fact must, play in civilian defense.

The lectures will be delivered by authorities on various subjects concerning home defense.

The women attending will be instructed on how to reorganize their households so that their families may enjoy the maximum of comfort and happiness under the conditions imposed by the war; how to cooperate with their air-raid wardens in equipping blackout and gas retreats and in combating incendiary bombs and the consequent fires; they will learn diet and nutrition, and how to cooperate in conservation and salvage campaigns.

IMPORTANT PROGRAM

The importance of this program cannot be overemphasized. Every woman should consider it a privilege and make it a duty to attend the lectures in her community.

The role of wives and mothers in defending their homes and families is a vital one, but one to whose significance San Francisco women, unfortunately, are not yet fully awake.

The organized civilian-defense services can go only so far, and when they have reached the limits of their capabilities, it is the women in their homes who must carry on from there.

It is the women, after all, who must maintain the morale in their homes.

And home morale is the heart of all morale.

It is the women who must arrange family budgets and family diets to maintain their families' health and spirits at the highest possible level.

It is the women who must take over many of the duties of air raid wardens during daytime, when their men are at their work.

ROLE OF WOMEN

It is the women who must minister to the sick and disabled, the aged and the infirm and the handicapped.

It is the women, in short, who must execute the details of civilian defense in all its many phases. In these things the trained and organized services can only direct them.

It is gratifying, then, that the American Women's Voluntary Services has arranged this program, that San Francisco's women may be acquainted with their responsibilities and taught how to discharge them.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein the article to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHANLEY, for 2 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. MAAS, indefinitely.

To Mr. BAUMHART, for 6 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two respects: First, to insert a resolution by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on the question of life-insurance premiums being deducted from income-tax returns; and, second, to include a resolution by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on war morale.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, since obtaining unanimous consent to insert in the Record the addresses of Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum and Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox, delivered at the commencement day luncheon at Columbia University on June 2, 1942, I have been informed by the Public Printer that these addresses will fill 3 pages of the Record, at a cost of \$135. I therefore renew my unanimous-consent request at this time to insert these addresses in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 10, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard of nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 10, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 10, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 2119, H. R. 2914, H. R. 4222, H. R. 6350, and H. R. 6858.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1731. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a set of proceedings of the forty-second national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Philadelphia, Pa., August 24-29, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 537); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1732. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1733. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the executive office of the President, Office for Emergency Management, for the fiscal year 1943, in the amount of \$70,000,000, to cover the expenses of the War Relocation

Authority in performing the functions placed upon it by Executive Order No. 9102 (H. Doc. No. 780); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products; without amendment (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 7112. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 7113. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, seat of government, and the States"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 7120. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2368. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7152. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; with amendment (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 7209. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7210. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7211. A bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 7212. A bill to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7213. A bill to provide for the attachment, garnishment, execution, or trustee process, of wages and salaries of officers and civil employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to establish the third week of September as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 503. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3039. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the United Brethren in Christ Sunday School, Clarence, N. Y., in behalf of Senate bill 860, to prohibit sale of alcoholic beverages on or near all Army camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3040. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Alta M. Orr and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3041. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Rev. J. L. Summers and 63 others, residents of Carmi, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 and any legislation which provides the best possible protection for our men in the armed forces against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3042. Also, petition submitted by K. McDonald and signed by 242 representative citizens of Cave-in-Rock, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3043. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the City Council of the city of Los Angeles, relative to legislation granting compensation benefits to civilian defense volunteers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3044. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. A. M. Russell and 47 others of the Highland Park Methodist Church, Topeka, Kans., appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; also urging the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3045. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Western Confectioners Association, at convention held at Santa Barbara, Calif., relative to candy as a food of high energy building content and not as a luxury, and therefore should not be subject to tax on luxuries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3046. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of Rev. George P. Kehl and members of two Sunday-school classes of the St. Paul's Evangelical and Reformed Church, St. Marys, Ohio, supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3047. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the George P. Vanderveer Post, No. 129, the American Legion, Toms River, N. J., urging the office of the War Production Board or such officials as may have jurisdiction to raise the ceiling price on scrap iron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, the Father of all mercies, we pray that Thy spirit of truth may rule and direct our hearts. As our fathers have left us a heritage of trial and sacrifice, may we realize that we have been appointed to a potent ministry to protect the weak and comprehend the problems of this modern, broken world; it is a deathless reality that the immortal soul is nourished by the bread of tears. Oh, clothe us with the strength of righteous purpose with Thy companionship on the one hand and the fellowship of man on the other.

Teach us, dear Lord, that victory does not come to the conquerors but to the saviors of mankind; to be satisfied with anything less is to be spiritually bloodless and sightless. We rejoice that with our inspirational faith we need not despair of the human race with the divine optimism of our blessed Master who ever inspires hope in the ultimate fulfillment of the great picture of man. Heavenly Father, call us to our labors with morning faces and with morning hearts, eager to work, and if the day be marked with hard toil make us strong to bear it. For the sake of Him who became poor that we might become rich. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a poem written by Annie Laurie Rankin, daughter of Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN of Mississippi, entitled "Wonder."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the statement that all the farm organizations were opposed to the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed at 85 percent of corn parity, an amendment that had been written into